DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 696 IR 051 267

TITLE Organizational Futures: Staffing Research Libraries in the 1990s. Minutes of the [Semiannual] Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (105th, Washington, D.C., October 24-25, 1984).

INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 85

NOTE 108p.; For related document, see ED 256 353.

AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 (ARL members, $7.50 per issue; nonmembers, $12.50 per issue).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Higher Education; *Library Administration; Library Associations; *Library Personnel; Library Planning; Library Research; Meetings; *Policy Formation; *Research Libraries; *Staff Role

ABSTRACT

Program presentations on issues related to staffing considerations in research libraries and business meeting minutes are combined in this report from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Under the program title, "Organizational Futures: Staffing Research Libraries in the 1990's," a report by the Task Force on Research Library Staffing addresses the roles and responsibilities of professional and support staff, the different staff categories and ratios that would exist in the near-term future, and the kinds of administrators and managers that would be needed in that environment. The report of the Task Force identifies an array of options through models that are designed to stimulate membership discussion. Concluding remarks summarize the points presented. Business meeting activities include reports from: the ARL Executive Director, the Committee on Collection Development, the Committee on ARL Statistics, the Office of Management Studies, and the ARL President. A report on the proposed North American Retrospective Conversion Project as well as guidelines for minimum preservation efforts in ARL libraries are also presented. Discussions of the election of vice-president/president-elect and new board members, as well as the change of officers, and dues increases for 1985 are included. Appendices provide background information for the reports; lists of meeting participants; members of the ARL board, task forces, and committees; and member libraries. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IR

ED261696

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

October 24-25, 1984
Washington, D.C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Minutes of the 105th Meeting

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Association of Research Libraries

IR051267

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICERS AND BOARD

1984

Eldred Smith, University of Minnesota — President
Richard J. Talbot, University of Massachusetts — Vice President/President-Elect
James F. Govan, University of North Carolina — Past President
Hugh C. Atkinson, University of Illinois (Oct. 1985)
Patricia Battin, Columbia University (Oct. 1985)
Graham R. Hill, McMaster University (Oct. 1986)
Herbert F. Johnson, Emory University (Oct. 1986)
W. David Laird, University of Arizona (Oct. 1986)
William J. Studer, Ohio State University (Oct. 1984)
Paul Vassallo, University of New Mexico (Oct. 1985)
Anne Woodsworth, University of Pittsburgh (Oct. 1984)

STAFF

Shirley Echelman	Executive Director
Duane E. Webster	Deputy Director and Director, Office of Management Studies
Pingfeng Chi	Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials
Jaia Barrett	Program Officer
Julia Blixrud	Conser A&I Project Coordinator
Nicola Daval	Information Officer
Jeffrey J. Gardner	Associate, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey Heynen	Program Officer
Susan Jurow	Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Jutta R. Reed-Scott	Collection Development Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine K. Sitts	Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies

Organizational Futures: Staffing Research Libraries in the 1990s

Minutes of the 105th Meeting

October 24-25, 1984
Washington, D.C.

1985
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members: $15.00 per year, $7.50 an issue
Nonmembers: $25.00 per year, $12.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st-42d. Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress

Printed in U.S.A. ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

ORGANIZATIONAL FUTURES: STAFFING RESEARCH LIBRARIES IN THE 1990'S

INTRODUCTION

Remarks by Mr. Smith 3
Remarks by Mr. Webster 3

ORGANIZATIONAL PROJECTIONS FOR ASSESSING FUTURE RESEARCH LIBRARY STAFFING NEEDS AND PROSPECTS
Duane E. Webster with the Task Force on Research Library Staffing 6

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION 16

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of Vice President/President-elect 27
Report of the ARL Executive Director 27
Report on the Proposed North American Retrospective Conversion Project 29
Report of the Committee on Collection Development 38
Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics 40
Election of New Board Members 41
Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries 41
Report of the Office of Management Studies 44
Report of the ARL President 46
Change of Officers 47
Dues Increase for 1985 47

APPENDICES

A. ARL Activities and Status Report, May 1984-October 1984

B. "Summary of Recommendations", Chapter 6 of *Retrospective Conversion*; report of a meeting sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, July 16-18, 1984

C. Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries

D. Status of OMS Programs, May-September 1984

E. Attendance
    Member Institutions
    Name Index for Members
    Guests and Staff

F. Officers, Board, and Committees and Task Forces of the Association of Research Libraries

G. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 105th Meeting

Eldred Smith, Presiding

The 105th Membership Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Ramada Renaissance Hotel in Washington, D.C., on October 24-25, 1984.

The program session was held in two parts. On Wednesday afternoon, October 24, the program began with an introduction to the topic. Immediately following, the membership and guests reconvened into small discussion groups. On Thursday, October 25, the session began with a report on the group discussions, followed by the business meeting.

INTRODUCTION

MR. SMITH (University of Minnesota): The basis for today's program is the work of the ARL Task Force on Research Library Staffing, a task force that included in its membership Millicent Abell, Nancy Brown, Irene Hoadley, John McGowan, Russell Shank, and myself. This task force was appointed two and one-half years ago with the charge to identify the nature, roles, and configuration of staff that will be required in academic research libraries over the next decade, and to make recommendations as to the role that ARL can play in assisting its member libraries to move into that new environment.

Specifically, the task force was asked to address the roles and responsibilities of professional and support staff, the different staff categories and ratios that would exist in this library of the near-term future, and the kinds of administrators and managers that would be needed in that environment. As we set about our task, we recognized that we were being asked to forecast the future, not through study and analysis but on the basis of our knowledge and experience. As we worked, we recognized not that there were at least as many different forecasts of the future as there were task force members, but that none of us had a view of what research libraries would be like ten years from now that was at all certain and detailed. At the same time, we were keenly aware of major changes and pressures for change that were profound, possibly sweeping, and perhaps inevitable. Indeed, as we experienced difficulty in fulfilling our charge, we became even more convinced of its importance.

It was at this point that we turned to Duane Webster for assistance. Together we worked out a strategy to identify an array of options through models that could serve as a basis of membership discussion. By this process, it was our attempt to stimulate and assist all of you together in working through this complex, difficult, but critically important issue.

This is where we are today. We have prepared the models to stimulate and organize discussion. We hold no particular brief for any of them. Indeed, we are not convinced that all research libraries ten years from now will follow a single model, nor are we convinced, even if such is the case, that that model would necessarily be one of those that we have identified. Indeed, it could well be a somewhat different model that incorporates features of several, perhaps all, of models that are before you. We hope and expect that our work will stimulate the discussion necessary to move our Association forward in addressing this important cluster of issues.

Now I would like to turn the floor over to Duane, who will review with you the logistics for this afternoon's session.

MR. WEBSTER (Office of Management Studies): I would also like to comment briefly on the background and the ideas that went into the construct of these models. Our work with this strategic concern as to where research libraries might go over the next ten years really began with the Management Institute for Directors that was conducted in the spring of this year. At that time, we had put together a series of three scenarios that speculated about the impact of technology on research libraries over the next ten years. In working through those scenarios with that group of directors, we found some limitations in the approach.

The notion with a true scenario is to take a single theme and then apply it in a future situation with specific illustrations. The theme most commonly used is changed technology. Part of what we learned from the directors at the institute is that there are more driving forces in the environment than simply technology. Surely, technology is one of those central forces—the prospects, for example, of communication technology changing the form and flow of scholarly information, and the prospect of computer applications altering the very character of the work of libraries. But there are additional factors that must be considered and that do not really fit into that scenario approach. These factors include: the dramatically increasing amount of new knowledge that we are facing and attempting to cover; the fact that the volume of information is doubling every seven years and is simply outstripping the capacities of research libraries to acquire, process, and make available that information; the notion, furthermore, that the labor force that we are working with is in fact going through some changes—the work force is becoming older, it is becoming a bit more stable, and the mismatch between educational attainment and skill requirements is becoming more dramatic. Also significant is the fact that there is going to be more leisure time. There is an expectation that the people working in our organizations are going to be more affluent and will have, possibly, a different set of aspirations that are more oriented toward job security, more oriented toward having meaningful job assignments that allow them to make significant contributions and a work environment that allows growth and recognition.

These changes in the labor force, coupled with changes in the information process and technology, all need to be taken into account in dealing with speculations about the future. To do this we moved away from the notion of a single theme scenario model to the construction of organizational projections that encompass trends in multiple areas.

The effort to project these possible organizational configurations is a strategic activity, and needed to answer the questions of what skills research libraries are going to have to recruit for in the future and what changes are needed to use these skills gainfully in our organizations. Related questions include: How are we going to be able to provide a proper work environment for this new set of skills? What methods are going to be available for us to achieve greater productivity and to extend service capabilities in these organizations? What types of organizational structures are going to be best suited to allow that work to be coordinated and to allow that work to be done efficiently?

These models are attempts first to stimulate broad discussion about the key factors that may well influence the future of research libraries, and second, to be able to take the active posture of attempting to influence those forces in order to achieve a preferred or desirable future.

That brings me to the logistics for the discussions today. First, there is a particular format that we suggest you follow as a way of moving through this consideration of possible futures.

Second, after you make an assessment of likelihood of a particular option, we are asking you to consider whether that is a desirable option for your library in the next ten years.

Third, we want you to consider some of the critical factors that exist in this environment that you as chief executive officers need to be concerned about, either in moving toward a desirable future or in working against an undesirable prospect.

We are going to have 11 groups discussing each of these options over the course of the next two hours. I would like you, in working through this format, to follow three basic ground rules. First, that you go to the group that you were assigned to, even though you might find another group more attractive. Second, please stay with and work with this group for two hours. Third, this is a format that is very deliberately intended to get your involvement and for you to exchange views with your colleagues, so please participate.

This structure is intended to have broad involvement and lead to observations and judgments which will be reported tomorrow morning. The leaders have agreed to follow this structure and I believe your support and help will make this structure succeed.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROJECTIONS FOR ASSESSING FUTURE RESEARCH LIBRARY STAFFING NEEDS AND PROSPECTS

prepared by

Duane E. Webster

with the advice and guidance of

The ARL Task Force on Research Library Staffing:

Millicent Abell
Nancy Brown
Irene Hoadley
John McGowan
Russell Shank
Eldred Smith, Chairman

October 3, 1984

INTRODUCTION

The intent of these organizational projections is to provide distinct options in which to assess staffing needs and possibilities for research libraries in the next decade. Each option is derived from speculations about how universities and their libraries will embrace technological and other environmental developments. For the most part, the descriptions are not specific in order to allow a wide ranging examination of library prospects. The following assumptions were made in the construction of these options:

- While larger research libraries are the target of discussion, organizational agility and responsiveness to pressures will be based on size, tradition, scope and nature of academic programs, governance patterns, and relationships to external systems.
- The view taken for discussion purposes is system-wide and administrative, recognizing that particular components of the organization and various clientele groups may view the same issues quite differently.
- The time frame is ten years to allow the patterns identified to emerge as operating differently.
- While a composite option may be derived from the four choices presented, it is hoped that the descriptions illustrate issues and lead to consideration of initiatives needed to achieve a preferred future.
- All options involve certain basic concerns such as an estimate of financial prospects, cooperative programs, philosophy and value systems, technology, internal resource allocation and share of the financial resources of the university, relationships with primary client groups, and the integration of historical tools and resources into the emerging organization.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

The following four questions should be used in the exploration of each option:

1. What factors in the universtiy situation are more influential in moving toward this option?
2. Is this option feasible or likely for your library?
3. Is this a preferred future for your library?
4. What needs to be done to prepare now for this future?

OPTION ONE

Definition: This center provides traditional physical and bibliographic access to published knowledge, employing some automated techniques to achieve needed economies. Primary sources are hard copy documents, with computerized bibliographic control provided for most collections owned. Telecommunication is used to provide supplementary access to required data files. Commercial automated information services are available on a fee basis. Full public services are provided on an on-demand basis responding to specific requests for assistance, especially in the use of the collection and the facility. The card catalog is closed but limited retrospective conversion prevents a fully functioning on-line catalog. Staff are general purpose librarians with a fair amount of functional specialization.

University Context: The university takes a cautious approach to introducing and using technological innovations. Faculty departments operate autonomously with little need or desire to coordinate with other units. University planning is largely incremental rather than strategic. Fiscal constraints and other issues lead to a philosophy of "wait and see" rather than one of innovation or experimentation. The university treats information related functions in a laissez-faire fashion wth the computer center, the academic departments, and the library pursuing specialized and competing agendas. Assessment of the library focuses more on the size and scope of the collections than on the quality and effectiveness of information delivery.

Philosophy and Role: The success of the library is measured by university administrators in terms of controlling costs and minimizing complaints. Maintaining needed levels of acquisitions is the faculty view of success. Ownership rather than access to required documents is viewed as the ideal. Faculty occasionally use commercial and professional data bases to secure needed documents directly from authors or commercial document delivery agencies. The library is viewed as a general resource for instruction and student work. The faculty rely on the research level collections for support in their subject specialties. Self-directed access to the library facility and resources is viewed as a traditional and cost effective way of obtaining and using information and materials.

Strategic Concerns:

1. Maintaining current functions and mission within a series of budget reductions and expansions.

2. Securing the required percentage of published literature in the face of continuing inflation and a growing volume and array of materials.

3. Assessing and installing tested technology that is affordable and meets performance requirements.

4. Maintaining a competent staff committed to the delivery of traditional library services.

5. Securing an increasing proportion of the university's operating budget to contend with inflation.

6. Entering into and strengthening cooperative arrangements in order to address problems that require resources beyond the financial capacity of the individual university.

Staffing Issues:

1. Staff size: This is a labor-intensive and book-oriented library requiring major allocations for acquisitions and staff. The 1984 median pattern of ARL member allocation of 35% for collections, 55% for staff, and 10% for other (this includes network charges, telecommunication costs, supplies, equipment and computer maintenance charges) will not be altered drastically.

2. Staff composition: Since this calls for the same type of people to do roughly the same work as today, the composition of the staff can be examined by assessing demographics. There will be more younger people in our libraries as the baby boomers fill slots. Seventy percent of the staff will be under 40 years of age. Forty-seven precent will have 10 years of experience or less. Traditional avenues of advancement will be limited and a large bulk of staff will reside at entry or junior level positions.

3. Staff skills and qualities: This option may not attract or keep the best people because of the relatively low level of innovation and experimentation, limited career advancement opportunities, and strong pressure to work longer and harder without significant pay increases.

4. Staff organization and classification: A functional organization encompassing reader services, technical services, collection management, and administration will continue to be the prevalent structure. Classification for staff will become more rigid and specified due to a variety of factors including decreased turnover, growth of collection bargaining, etc.

5. Staff training and development: Library interest in upgrading staff skills and improving staff performance leads to more investment in training although the character of this training continues to be episodic and responsive to short-term needs. There is no specific budget for training.

OPTION TWO

Definition: The library continues to center around the traditional functions of acquiring, housing, organizing, and making available printed resources that support the instructional and research missions of the university. The library has automated most functions and provides on-line bibliographic access to its collections as well as to most of the nation's published literature. On-line information services are provided for most subjects emphasized by the university. In addition, the library has assumed an information transfer role wherever it is available (extensive use is made of formal network and consortia arrangements) and providing this information to users regardless of academic status. Information services are emphasized and aggressive outreach programs such as end user searching and information management education are operated. The library staff has a number of specialists with most librarians operating with multiple responsibilities that cut across the traditional functions. Networks and cooperative arrangements are used extensively to provide backup support and achieve savings in bibliographic control and access to needed materials. The card catalog has been closed and retrospective conversion completed.

University Context: There is a visible commitment to extend and enhance the information capability of the university through the encouragement of practical technological innovation. The driving forces are economics, strong and extensive investment in traditional means (especially the library), and the availability of affordable, useful automation. While cost control is a prominent concern, there has been an effort to plan comprehensively and strategically, particularly in light of the changing demographics of students, the new emphasis on the use of information, and the need to compete with other institutions of higher education. The extent of change in university curriculum and scholarly practices is, however, limited by some lethargy and anxiety among the faculty, particularly in the traditionally strong departments. There are increasing numbers of faculty enthusiastic about the potential of technology.

Philosophy and Role: Success of the library is viewed primarily in terms of growth in collections, relative status among higher education institutions, and reputation for responsiveness to campus interests. The notion of access to information resources is promoted and there is a deliberate library management strategy of focusing on user needs and striving to satisfy those needs. The library provides newer technologically-based services as a supplement to traditional library activities.

Strategic Concerns:

1. Most of the concerns noted in the first option apply here as well. Since this is a less stable model there are added leadership challenges for introducing and managing change, including maintaining parallel systems.

2. Reorganization of staff in a low-turnover environment to make greater use of skills and experience while employing technology to improve productivity in performing the traditional functions.

3. Improving supervisory and management practices with a growing concern for improved individual performance and output.

4. Entering into and strengthening cooperative arrangements in order to meet the problems of inflation, preservation of deteriorating collections, and efficient production of bibliographic records.

5. Developing better understanding of users, especially faculty information needs and use patterns.

6. Budgeting for the provision of new technologically based services provided as a supplement for traditional services.

Staffing Issues:

1. Staff size: This option calls for an increasing proportion of the library's budget to be allocated to the "other" category, i.e. network charges, telecommunication charges, computer maintenance charges, and miscellaneous expenses — possibly as much as 15 to 20%. As a result, some reduction in acquisitions or staff will be required. Because libraries are experiencing significant reduction in purchasing power for printed materials, it seems unlikely that shifting funds from this category will be acceptable. Therefore some reduction in staff as well as a shift in responsibilities is called for in this model. The internal allocation of resources might follow a pattern for 35% for acquisitions, 50% for staff, and 15% for other.

2. Staff composition: Among the shifts occurring will be a movement of staff from technical to public services. The demographic trends described in Option One will apply here also. The overall structure will be more flexible and fluid than Option One.

3. Staff skills and qualities: This option calls for a staff that is at ease with technology but possessing solid traditional skills. A greater demand will be placed on those who have verbal communication skills, work well in group settings, write clearly and easily, and are quite flexible and adaptable in dealing with changing assignments and multiple reporting relationships.

4. Staff organization and classification: A flatter organization seems likely with project groups used as a primary means for solving problems and delivering services. While this can lead to increased staff participation and job satisfaction, it may reduce traditional promotion opportunities.

5. Staff training and development: The added capabilities and greater flexibility characteristic of the option result in a larger investment in staff training. There is comprehensive planning and ongoing attention to the development of individual skills and contributions. There will be a significant budget allocation for this purpose and a major senior level position with responsibilities for training and development.

OPTION THREE

Definition: The library evolves to a series of sophisticated discipline-oriented information services modeled after the medical field where national and regional services provide the infrastructure for local agencies to provide timely, user-tailored information support. Such service is available in the humanistic and historical studies, social sciences, physical sciences, biological sciences, and the prominent professional schools through decentralized, institutionalized information units. Public services vary according to the characteristics and needs of the discipline but tend to be personalized and intense, relying extensively on technology for access to required information. The staff consists mainly of subject specialists with many of the traditional functions of acquiring and cataloging of published literature achieved through commercial and network services. A central library capability exists to operate certain basis instructional support functions, provide document delivery services from the remote storage and central collection, and maintain communication and coordination among local information services and the regional, national, and international agencies relied upon for information access and retrieval.

University Context: There is increasing specialization in the research arena, with institutions securing private and federal support to establish cooperative centers that address societal concerns on an interdisciplinary basis. These centers are closely related to the redirection of university organization to emphasize and facilitate the way scholars work together. The use of affinity groups for organizing disciplines becomes stronger. In addition, there are special purpose educational institutions both within the traditional not-for-profit domain as well as other settings, where educational programs are operated by major corporations. As a result, the familiar university centralized structure is modified, with more budget and program control extended to colleges and smaller units.

Philosophy and Role: There is a great deal of diversity in the definition of the university's information services with success of these services tied to the work of scholars in the discipline or the interdisciplinary centers. As a result, the science information services are measured on the basis of speed, responsiveness, and relevance. The humanistic and historical studies information support is evaluated in terms of breadth, richness, and variety. The driving goal is meeting the specialized needs of scholars via access to a variety of local, regional, and national services that are maintained and operated on campus for the benefits of local users.

Strategic Concerns:

1. Organization and use of information in the disciplines and the relationships among the different centers.

2. Securing the subject oriented staff to provide the information services required and integrating them into the research library environment in a period of low staff turnover.

3. Developing and maintaining relationships with faculty in the disciplines, particularly in regard to librarians working as part of the institutional or research project team.

4. Maintaining and strengthening the relationships with national services and agencies particularly with regard to the national information infrastructure that needs to be created in some instances.

5. Budgeting for and funding the costs associated with network and technology based information services.

6. Securing the risk capital to convert to this form of decentralized information service.

7. Acquainting specialized faculty with the broad range of information and information services available outside of their specialty.

Staffing Issues:

1. Staff size: The substantial investment in technology and network services along with the reliance on subject specialists will argue for reallocation of funds from acquisitions to the other categories while maintaining the labor intensive character of current operations. The division of funds may be 25% for acquisitions, 55% for staff, and 20% for other. Some additional short-term funding may be needed to manage required turnovers in staff during a period which is not conducive to turnover.

2. Staff composition: A shift from functional specialists to subject specialists will be highlighted. The support staff will be management and computer specialists. There would be relatively low levels of acquisitions, and thus technical services staff would be greatly reduced.

3. Staff skills and qualities: In this option the subject credentials are assumed and the parallel concerns of personality characteristics such as confidence, energy level, and ability to influence become prominent. There are also significant requirements to work well in group settings and to manage time and set priorities independently.

4. Staff organization and classification: This option calls for a variety or organizational structures depending on the requirements of the discipline being supported. The coordination of these information outposts will be a concern but there should be some effort to move staff among units to ensure the interdisciplinary perspective. Smaller support staffs and the reliance on the subject specialist may lead to less concern directed toward classification structures and greater opportunities for job enrichment and growth.

5. Staff training and development: There may be less need for a major retraining effort in this option since the focus is on getting people with a different set of credentials. The development needs in this option will be oriented more toward keeping abreast of technological and discipline advancements.

OPTION FOUR

Definition: Campus coordination for the production, dissemination, and use of scholarly and administrative information is centralized in a highly automated Academic Information Center. University planning councils advise the center which has the responsibility for policy making, research, operations, funding, and strategic planning for all aspects of academic information use including instruction, research, personnel, financial, curriculum, and student records. Traditional functions included within the center are computer, library, telecommunications, publishing, and media services. There is a university vice president in charge of the information function. Information services are equipment-based and highly interactive, with users effectively designing information strategies to solve their research and instructional problems. The primary mode of operation is end user searching of data bases without personal assistance. Center staff are largely technical and managerial specialists with a few general purpose information staff. Document storage and bibliographic control functions are maintained by national agencies. Access and delivery services are coordinated by the Academic Information Center.

University Context: Education is largely indivdualized, with scholars receiving most of their information through electronic media. Researchers may work easily in interuniversity research projects irrespective of geographical or organizational location. Students rely on satellite mediated long-distance communication systems to allow two-way audiovisual and digital conferences, selecting course offerings from a variety of agencies. The university as an organization is quite centralized, coordinating the flow of information to provide the essential services scholars and students require on a decentralized basis. The information center may be operated on a regional or state-wide basis with a traditional library maintained as an archival node in the network.

Philosophy and Role: Ready access to information regardless of type, source, location, or format is the mission of the Academic Information Center. Work includes development of knowledge bases (automated encyclopedias), deployment of technology, and system design. Success will be determined by the achievement of economies of scale as well as by the provision of sophisticated new information capabilities. With increasing use of personal computers, document delivery, and data banks, the traditional service role is taken over by the end user with the information center staff serving as brokers among utilities and users. Training in use of information in the disciplines is either assumed by the teaching faculty or is accomplished through machine based methods.

Strategic Concerns:

1. The risk capital required to establish such a capability.
2. User reaction to depersonalized services.
3. Disposal of a large cadre of traditionally trained librarians.

4. Defining and maintaining working collections for faculty whose interest in books and journals does not diminish. This may involve shaping faculty attitudes.

5. The role and impact of artificial intelligence on the use of information.

6. The progress toward this option that can be achieved within as short a time span as ten years.

7. Achieving operating economies promised by declining costs of computer hardware, software, and storage.

8. Defining what a library is in a technologically sophisticated environment.

Staffing Issues:

1. Staff size: This model suggests a reversal of present allocation practices wth more spent on the "other" category than on acquisitions, e.g. 15% collections, 45% staff, and 40% for technology based costs. While staff size may be greatly reduced, staff costs may remain high because of the type of technical and management staff needed and because the overall costs of the operation may be less.

2. Staff composition: While there may be some service staff to mediate the exchange among users and information sources, the emphasis in this model is on machine-based services. As a result, the information center requires management and technical specialists both for operation and delivery functions.

3. Staff skills and qualities: There are few non-skilled jobs in this option. Because information is accessed directly by users via machines, the primary staff skills are technologically oriented.

4. Staff organization and classification: This option calls for a more rigid organization, highly centralized and dependent on the technology from which it derives its basis mode of operation.

5. Staff training and development: Staff will be expected to keep up-to-date on technological developments through reading, special institutes, etc.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

MR. WEBSTER: This morning's program is an informal review of the reports from the discussion groups yesterday. I will provide general reactions to the models, and information on group assessments of likelihood and desirability of these alternative projections. I welcome additional comments or reactions from you this morning.

The purpose of yesterday's discussions was twofold. First, we wanted to clarify some of the expectations and preferences of the ARL directors in regard to possible futures. Second, we wanted to develop a better understanding of the construct of those alternative futures. The ARL Task Force on Research Library Staffing will use the results of these discussions to plan a response—projects, programs, activities—for the Association to consider in response to likely futures.

In speculating about the future, I did a little research in order to get some insight into forecasting as a science, and found that some distinguished experts from recent history have attempted to define the future. Their experience may set a context for our own speculations.

In 1943 IBM's Chairman, Thomas Watson, said: I think there's a world market for about five computers.

In 1958, Business Week magazine reported that with over 50 foreign cars already on sale here the Japanese auto market is not likely to carve out a big slice of the U.S. market for itself.

In 1947, Darryl Zanuck said: TV will not be able to hold onto any market it captures after the first six months. People will soon get tired of staring at a plywood box every night.

And, finally, Henry Luce, founder and publisher of Time, in 1956, said: By 1980, all power—electric, atomic, solar—is likely to be virtually costless.

These statements suggest that there are certain hazards in speculating about the future. With those hazards in mind, several lessons might complement the work we did yesterday. First, forecasting is risky, as the quotes illustrate. There is incomplete information on future environments with conflicting expert opinion. It is very difficult to chart a course knowing that a few years later your staff will be quoting back to you prophetic statements that you have made. And the current environment is fragmented; it is hard to analyze and understand the trends that we may be able to identify. Another lesson is that the questions we ask about where we are going are likely to influence our thinking, and ultimately influence the directions we take. Furthermore, the time frame used in our forecasting is arbitrary. Clearly, fewer things happen in ten years than we now expect, but the converse is also true. More seems to happen over the short term, in the five-year period, than we expect. So, in the strategic planning process, there is a need to have a certain vision, a certain sense of where we are going, but a practical reality that changes might not be occurring as quickly on that long-term scale as we would like.

With this view of forecasting in mind, I turn now to the reactions of the small discussion groups to the organizational projections for research libraries. The comments indicate that there are good elements, interesting points, and informative pieces in these several different projections. It is clear, however, that these models are not perfect or ideal, and that they do not fit all circumstances equally well.

The comment that seemed to come up over and over again was that there is not a single likely future that can be described as suitable or feasible for most of the ARL membership. Research libraries will progress at different rates and display a diversity that argues against construction of a single option.

Thus these options do no present an optimal model, but instead provide a forum for exploration of relevant issues. While these four do not give us the perfect design, they do suggest the importance of constructing personal models in order to capture the diversity and uniqueness of each of your situations.

The four models were developed with the advice of the ARL Staffing Task Force, and have gone through a number of iterations. The task force members reviewed them, and I have used them in at least five workshops this past summer. There are certain factors that went into the design of the model projections that you may want to be familiar with in order to understand the results of the discussion and to design your own projections for your institution.

First, there are the trends that we chose to look at in the context of understanding the changing environment within which research libraries must perform. The university setting, for example, is very influential in determining the nature and effectiveness of a research library, so we tried to speculate on the range of changes that may be occurring there. In each of these projections there is a different estimate of university development.

The second set of trends examined was information technology. Speculations on what is going to happen and how fast communication technology and automation may advance is a very important judgment factor that needs to be taken into account. An aspect of this assessment is how quickly your institution will be able to adapt, engage, and apply available technology.

The third set of trends concerned user capabilities and expectations. The demands for performance placed on us by our users are increasing and changing.

The fourth set of trends related to development of national information systems and infrastructures. By this we mean the establishment and operation of systems, protocols, and procedures for access in bibliographic and other information networks. In terms of option three and option four, for example, much of the forecast is dependent upon developments happening either within the disciplines or on a national basis that will allow research libraries to take advantage of those with different organizational responses.

The final category concerns the notion that library philosophy, role, and performance measures will, in fact, be different from institution to institution and will change over time. This came out very clearly in the discussions yesterday. What is desirable for you in your circumstances should be a reflection of your philosophy, your values, your sense of what a library ought to be doing. Obviously, this sense of purpose and role will vary from library to library.

While the ARL task force helped assess trends and changes in the research library environment, I drew upon an OMS model to establish methods for engaging the projected changes in the environment. The first approach is avoidance, that is, to not deal with changes in the environment and to emphasize maintenance of the present enterprise. This approach defends status quo, resists change, and tries to maintain traditional values.

The second approach is selective engagement of those changes that seem to be attractive or convenient. The third approach is simply to try to reflect the environment in a mirror-like fashion, being neither too far ahead of it nor behind it, but trying to be in step with the changes taking place.

The fourth approach is a more aggressive, active, dynamic model where you not only understand, identify, and deal with the changes that are taking place and adapt to those, but also attempt to influence those changes. Application of these four approaches to the trends identified earlier results in, as you might expect, a matrix which allows construction of an array of futures designed to be uniquely directed toward specific institutions.

These assessments and strategies allow creation of four organizational projections that were the basis of our discussions yesterday. Obviously, these four projections do not fully exploit that matrix but they are an attempt to apply it.

Now we come to the interesting part: examining the data that you provided in terms of working through these options and reacting to them. I will report on each of these options in turn and invite additional reactions from the floor.

The first projection describes a library providing traditional physical and bibliographic access. Automation is used to a limited extent in processing and bibliographic control, and commercial automated information services are available on a fee basis. Staff are general purpose librarians with a fair amount of functional specialization. Faculty assessment of the library focuses more on the size and scope of the collections than on the quality and effectiveness of information delivery. For the university administration, library success is measured in terms of controlling costs and minimizing complaints.

The labels I asked you to suggest give you a good feeling for how people reacted generally to this projection: "On the road to insignificance"; "Status quo"; "The dinosaur stage"; "Yesterday"; "Fossil"; and "Non-survival."

Each group then assigned numerical rankings of 1 to 10 for the likelihood of each option being predominant in the next five- to ten-year period, and of the desirability of that option being the predominant one during this period. For the first option, the likelihood scores ranged, for the most part, from 0 to 3.8, although one group did assign a score of 8.8 (scores within this group ranged from 6 to 10). Thus, in terms of the data, you can see that, with one exception, the strategic judgments of this group are that this option is not going to be a likely future. The desirability of this option ranged from 0 to 3.1, with most being 2.5 or less.

I might comment on the nature of these scores. This is not scientific information. Rather, this is an inventory of perceptions on the part of the directors at this point in time, and it is not intended to be benchmark data that we are going to do research on subsequently. With this in mind, you can observe, most people do not see this first projection as a likely prospect, and everybody, it appears, believes it is not a desirable prospect.

The key strategic factors identified by the groups included: the continued education of administration, faculty, and staff—a lot hinges on administrative attitude, staff attitude, and staff dynamics; organizational inertia; funding going to competing agencies—the notion that the library is no longer a sacred cow deserving of special support; stable teaching faculty; and the lack of available performance measures to stimulate an understanding of differences in potential.

I also noticed other comments with regard to Option One in general. One individual observed that universities are very conservative: "I never underestimate the conservatism of faculty when it comes to matters affecting them." So that, even though this is not a desirable future prospect, the conservative character of the institutions might unavoidably lead in this direction.

Another observation: "We are a conservative institution and are starting behind many other libraries." This point underscores the notion that starting point is going to influence your speed and achievement.

Another observation was that the research library in particular appeals to traditional values and those traditional values seem to secure more in terms of fund raising and organizational support than maybe some of the newer values or technological applications.

Other comments on this projection included: "We are past this point." "This is actually a description of libraries today."

In the second projection, the library continues to center around traditional functions of acquiring, housing, organizing, and making available printed resources. Most functions are automated, and online information services are provided for most subjects emphasized by the university. The library staff has number of specialists with most librarians operating with multiple responsibilities that cut across traditional functions. The university has a stated commitment to extend and enhance the information capability of the university through the encouragement of practical technological innovation. For the administration, success of the library is viewed primarily in terms of growth in collections, relative status among higher education institutions, and reputation for responsiveness to campus interests.

Some of the labels assigned to this option were "transitional," "semi-brilliant" (as compared with semi-literate); "Baseline, progressive"; "Neanderthal"; "Half-done"; "Today"; "Responsive"; "Lethargic"; and "Plausible."

For this option, the likelihood scores ranged from 2 to 9.6, with most of the scores converging in the middle of that range. Desirability scores ranged from 1.5 to 7.0, with the scores cluster at either 3.1 or less and 5.7 or more.

Of the four options, this seems to be most likely. Why? Because many libraries are going in this direction. It is foreseeable, and reasonable. It is a logical extension of where we are today. So the degree to which we are able to assign likelihood to this is very easy and, thus, we come up, for the most part, with high scores.

In terms of feasibility, however, there is a bit more of a mixture. There is a sense by some people that this is not going far enough. It is not imaginative enough and does not project a road into the future that fully achieves our potential.

Some of the key strategic factors suggested in this projection include: faculty acceptance; desire for traditional collections; peer pressure, in the sense that other libraries are doing this; user expectations; scarcity of book dollars; campus networks that are being developed; a knowledge base that is changing in the disciplines; and administrative pressure. Also, it was noted that funding is a critical factor or as well as the ability to make campus-wide decisions, and the need to deliver high quality service.

Generally, the reaction to this option was very positive; many of you seemed to like it. In terms of the comments from the discussion leaders, after that initial blush of: "Yes, this seems to work," there were a series of more critical comments:

"This is some progress, but not enough."

"While it is solid and realistic, it did not go far enough and many of us are already beyond this."

"It is not challenging enough."

"If we are not far beyond this point by ten years, we are going to be in deep trouble."

Another comment was that this might be the library option for the future with other services taking place outside the library and working in parallel or in concert with the library.

There were several additional driving forces noted. One comment made was that by the 1990s a large group of faculty will be retiring and, with new faculty coming into the higher educational scene, this might be, in fact, an incentive to move beyond this model.

In the third projection library service is viewed as a series of discipline-oriented information services with national and regional services operating the infrastructure for local agencies to provide timely, user-tailored information support. Public services tend to be personalized and intense. The staff consists mainly of subject specialists with many of the traditional functions of acquiring and cataloging material handled by commercial and network services. Certain functions, primarily basic instructional support and document delivery, are centralized. This option is marked by substantial diversity in the definition of the university's information services with the success of these services tied to the work of scholars in a variety of interdisciplinary centers that have been established to investigate a variety of societal services.

In Option Three, more divergent data appears. A couple of interesting titles were suggested: "Subject division revisited." "Way out." "Getting there." "This is it." "Anarchy." "Adolescent." "Impractical." "High-tech." "Old fashioned." "Progressive." There is a nice series of contradictions apparent here!

The responses provided a mixed assessment of likelihood, with scores that ranged from 3.0 to 6.0. Several of the groups—those that gave a ranking of 5, 5.6, 5.86—seemed to be thinking of this as a real possibility; others were a bit more questioning. On the other hand, on the desirability scale, this option seemed almost as desirable as the second option, with range of 3.5 to 6.5, and most of the ratings 5.5. or more.

Some of the strategic factors identified include: staff attitudes; staff training; recruitment of necessary talent; supportive administration, money to the library; unions, the existence of unions and the obstacles they might provide; space; the increased specialization of research; the availability of more economical software; ability to respond quickly to changing environment; the development in information transfer; the availability of subject specialists; and the development of technology generally.

In terms of general comments, several groups thought that options two and three need to be blended as a way of coming up with a more optimal projection.

There was a question as to whether ten years is a time frame that is reasonable if we are talking about developments of this sort, a sense on the part of some people that this was highly desirable but most difficult to deal with. A comment made that this is a traditional way of modernizing the library.

Then, finally, the note that in some fields—medicine, possibly law—this could be more likely than in the university as a whole.

MR. SMITH: Duane, in terms of likelihood, you said this was similar to Option Two. But Option Two is more polarized on desirability, is it not?

MR. WEBSTER: Fair enough. Both of these seemed desirable to some components of the people discussing them.

MR. SMITH: But there was less of a mixed view on this one than on Option Two?

MR. WEBSTER: There were, however, pretty dramatic extremes within the groups, e.g. 2-9, 1-10, 3-9.

In the fourth projection, the production, dissemination, and use of scholarly and administrative information are centralized in a highly automated Academic Information Center. Along with responsibility for policy making, research, operation, funding, and strategic planning, the center includes such traditional services as library, computer, telecommunications, publishing, and media services. Center staff are largely technical and managerial specialists with a few general purpose information staff. Document storage and bibliographic control functions are maintained by national agencies; access and delivery are coordinated by the center. Education is largely individualized, with scholars receiving most of their information through electronic media. The university is centralized to coordinate the flow of information to provide the essential services scholars and students require on a decentralized basis. The center may be operated on a regional or state-wide basis with a traditional library maintained as an archival node in the network. Ready access to information regardless of type, source, location, or format is the mission of the center.

This option was called: "Big Brother." "Blue sky." "Star wars." I like this one: "Pay while you are on campus." Other titles given were: "Conflicting." "2001." "Frighteningly possible in some ways." "Off the wall." "Ascendancy of the computer center." "Brave new world (or now you have gone too far)."

There is a rather low estimate of likelihood, ranging from 1.0 to 3.8. It appears that for the most part this is not a likely future. There are some exceptions to this judgment, but clearly the thinking of the small groups in the aggregate is a bit more pessimistic about this projection.

In terms of desirability, some extreme views exist, with rankings spread along the scale from 1.1 to 6.5.

Factors mentioned included: the notion that vested interest is going to play a large role, as will personalities; that there is going to be certain faculty and administrative support and acceptance required; considerable redistribution of money and a reorganization of university administration will be required within the institution; a very technologically sophisticated clientele will be required, as well as certain developments with technology that do not seem to be available now; and availability of local capital.

Reactions to this model were that there are a lot of questions about this option but that we should not write it off entirely. It could look very attractive to certain vice presidents or provosts. While the concepts and maybe the model is not as coherent as the participants would like, there are some elements that make sense. There were some who believed that, if this was combined with several of the elements in other models, it could emerge as a very useful direction. Also, the comment was made that, while revolutionary, this option could make the university and library more identical in character, purpose, and function, so that the library would become the central activity, the central process, within the university.

Clearly, over the short run, this option is impossible. There was the comment or judgment made that this is contrary to the way things are going. It would actually change the nature of universities and this simply is not possible. But, while this may not be possible, if the university was a rational model, it could be a desirable option.

In terms of additional options, several efforts were made to come up with a fifth or more optimal option. The most specific work came from one group that said: Leave most of option four but change three important components: 1) the notion of increasing document storage and bibliographic function by regional and national agencies—this should be changed as there would be a variety of modes of operation oriented to the needs and preferences of users; 2) the notion of disposal of a large cadre of librarians was not universally accepted; and 3) the notion that the university context would have to be a lot more of a research-oriented center.

Another preferred model noted some different expectations, focusing on: the need for complete retrospective conversion, online catalogs, and database searching; no decrease in staff but more specialization in advanced degrees; some fiscal flexibility in funding; and some variety of organizational structure.

There are two broad categories of ideas of needs that seem to fall out of the discussions of prospective futures. The first is help in dealing with the key environmental factors identified. Invariably these factors seem to be beyond our control or direct influence. Responses to these external factors may include: 1) the need for more communication, influence, and alliances with university administrators, faculty, and donors; 2) methods and techniques for shaping the attitude and values of the staff; 3) better processes for introducing and managing change; 4) encouraging more broadly within the staff and management component of libraries strategic thinking of the sort that we are doing here—namely, future-oriented, broader-context action with an action bias; 5) techniques for scanning and analyzing this external environment so that we understand better what is taking place outside of the library, and are able to use that information to make decisions internally; 6) more flexible organizational structures; 7) nurture a risk-taking attitude on the part of staff within the library; and 8) changing the negative views of the research libraries, whether those negative views are held by prospective employees, donors, administration, faculty, or our users.

The second category of needs emanating out of these discussions related more specifically to the staffing questions we are considering. First is the notion that, if work is changing, and there seems to be a sense that there is a change in the basic character of the work, we will need techniques for analyzing job content, for identifying what the character and nature of that work is, and for locating different talents or different skills to respond to the changing nature of the work.

Second, new job design techniques or methods are needed, in order to make jobs that are more suitable to these new demands and new settings, and also to have jobs that are the type of challenging, useful, gainful employment of the people that we would hire.

Third is the element of recruitment, improved mechanisms for identifying necessary skills, as well as being able to hire for adaptability; that is, finding talent that is going to be able to engage a rapidly-changing prospect or a rapidly-changing future.

Fourth, the notion of organizational entry is identified. That is, once we have defined what it is that we need and have the people in the organization, how do we socialize, orient, and engage those people in the organizations so that their work and their relationship with the organization is constructive?

Fifth, the training area. This was an area that was commented on and dealt with almost by every group. It is training, it seems, at a number of different levels. One somewhat facetious comment suggested training ARL directors as information czars, preparing you to be—however that might be done—the locus of power within the insitution when it comes to the formulation of information policies. Also covered was the idea of retraining or continual training of staff: post-MLS training for middle-level people, guidelines for the education and training of ARL librarians. Another concern was the notion of rapid technological obsolescence. The rule of thumb has traditionally been seven years. Bill Shipp, who is the Associate Provost for Computing at Brown University, spoke at the Institute on Research Libraries for Library School Faculty held in Chapel Hill last July. His comment was that in the computer area, the technological obsolescence time frame now is three years; if you are not retraining or acquiring and growing and recasting your knowledge base, in three years you are out-of-date. Other types of training that were mentioned included analytical skills, people-managing skills training, group skills training, and technological skill training.

The next point that seemed to be mentioned frequently was the idea of creating the proper environment to get the type of results that you want out of staff. This relates to leadership and supervisory practices within the library—supervisory practices that will encourage people to take chances, try different things, promote creative problem-solving, and so forth.

Another item that I noticed in these reports is the unionization issue. That seemed to come up a lot, especially in terms of the need to examine the impact of unionization on our capacity to engage these prospective future environments.

A frequently-mentioned point concerned library education and the need for different preparations for people who are coming into research libraries.

The salary issue was also mentioned. This was not only the traditional salary issue of how do we attract and keep good people, but also the emerging issues of comparable worth/comparable pay that seems to be becoming a problem for some institutions.

The Task Force on Research Library Staffing is now going to review all of these points and determine what should be done next in terms of preparing a response and perhaps a strategy to deal with the resulting staffing issues.

I will finish by commenting briefly on your reaction to these discussions. First, there seems to be a feeling that this was a useful exchange amongst colleagues, a chance to get to know each other a little bit better, and also a chance to express strongly-conflicting points of view in an environment that not only tolerates and encourages that sort of active debate but also might lead to influencing us on some of these issues. The opportunity to deal with colleagues in a small group setting, pursuing a particular topic in a structured fashion, and dealing with future prospects is a stimulating activity. Some also indicated that the documentation provided could be used with staff as a way of encouraging additional thinking in this area.

I might add again that we have worked with this exercise as part of a special focus workshop and we are willing to do that with additional institutions. I believe, though, that the critical thing is designing your own projections and using that construct to shape your own future.

I invite additional questions or comments.

MR. WHITE (Indiana University): I wonder if it is your belief that out of all of this you will be able to develop some sort of a common denominator or consensus approach. I hear you saying, on the one hand, that we have looked at four options, which are very different scenarios, and they all have their supporters and they all have their detractors. Not only that, but I also hear you saying that there has to be an emphasis on individual decisions within each individual institution. So, with all of that as a background, looking at it as an educator, what can you tell me that we should be doing? Those are four very, very different educational models. Is it your hope that you will be able to grasp onto something that everybody will indeed be able to agree on?

MR. WEBSTER: Certainly, we have a contrast in approaches to looking at this. The Medical Library Association is currently sponsoring a major discussion of what the future might look like for medical libraries, and in that setting they are pushing toward the notion of an integrated health sciences information center. They have one set of projections that are along that continuum and they are striving to have everybody come into that pattern. There is a belief on the part of the task force and myself that that is not going to be the pattern for research libraries. There are a variety of capabilities and philosophies that presently exist, and the future is going to have a continuation of diversity.

In terms of preparing or educating for that diversity, the themes that come out of the discussion relating to those elements are adaptability; preparation for continual, ongoing learning; provision of a capability to retrain, update, and expand knowledge; as well as this notion of not only adaptability but creating a readiness, energy and orientation toward risk-taking and creative engagement of issues.

This gesture will demand more of the way students are prepared as much as the specific skills that are imparted.

MR. BUSHAW (Washington State University): I believe there may have been more consensus in some of these groups than these numbers indicate, because there were certain ambiguities in the way the questions were asked. To take a simple example, when you talked about ten years from now and the likelihood of being in a certain option, does that mean that the institution each of us represents will have been there within the next ten years or will still be there, so to speak, ten years from now? That could lead to very different responses.

Also, different people react more strongly to different aspects of the various pictures. I suspect that if the questions were sharpened in some way you might come to something much closer to a consensus.

MR. WEBSTER: Certainly, if we clarified or defined for ourselves the terms and the questions that we wanted to use, it would shape and influence the direction we would take in those discussions. There was some vagueness deliberately built into these so that you could shape the direction that you wanted without too much manipulation on the part of the scheme.

MS. McBURNEY (Queen's University): I believe it would be very useful for us to exploit the diversity and perhaps regroup according to our interests in various options to pursue this further so that we could help develop a real action plan that each of us would be interested in pursuing with a particular goal at the end of ten years at our institutions.

MR. WEBSTER: An interesting point. If we could group on preferred options and maybe even establish a group of those who want to design a new option, the prospects for discussion would be much different.

Other comments? Then, let me just summarize by saying that this activity was intended to stimulate discussion and consideration of some of those key environmental factors that are going to influence what our future might be in a variety of situations. Not only were we interested here in identifying those key factors, but we are also very much interested in helping determine or project the desired future that has to be driven by our own circumstances and then to help start working toward that desired future.

Thank you for your willing involvement in this activity.

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of Vice President/President-Elect

MR. SMITH: It is my very great pleasure to announce the result of the Board election for Vice President/President-Elect for 1985. The new Vice President/President Elect is Anne Woodsworth.

The next item on the agenda is a report from the Executive Director.

Report of the ARL Executive Director

MS. ECHELMAN: I want to begin by saying that I am delighted to see so many of you here today. In the years since May of 1981, when I first became a member of the ARL staff, this is the most complete attendance by ARL directors and designates that we have had at an ARL meeting, and I hope that bodes well for the future.

You have all received a copy of the Activities and Status Report for the Association for May 1984-October 1984. [See Appendix A.] It contains a progress report on activities listed in the ARL Plan of Action. I am not going to use any time this morning either to summarize or highlight that report. I would be happy to discuss any portion or all of it with you, however, either communally at this session, individually during the meeting, or by phone or letter. I would appreciate having any comments or questions. We tried to be complete, but ARL is becoming more and more active, and it is very difficult to compress all the activities into a few pages of report. So we use the activities report, the newsletter, and various other means of communicating with you about what the Association is doing. We get surprisingly little feedback, and I would very much like to learn whether you find this is a good way to report, whether the Newsletter is giving you the information you need, or whether you would like us to try something new or something in addition.

I would like to take a few minutes this morning to introduce several new ARL staff members.

First, Jeffrey Heynen, a new ARL Program Officer. Most of you know Jeffrey, who has been Coordinator of the ARL Microforms Project, but you have not met him as a full-time member of the staff yet.

Jaia Barrett, our second new Program Officer. Jaia was formerly the Head of the Documents Department at Duke University. She will have responsibility for keeping us all up to date about legislative and other federal activities, making sure that we do and say the right thing at the right time and in the right place.

Susan Jurow has just joined the OMS staff as a Training Specialist. Susan was formerly Assistant to the Director of the Northern Regional Library Facility, University of California, Richmond Field Station. You will be hearing from Susan about management institutes, special focus institutes, and other training activities.

Julia Blixrud has been on our staff for some time but she has not been at an ARL meeting before. She is the Project Manager for the CONSER A & I Project, working with a small staff based at the National Serials Data Program Office at the Library of Congress. Julia was formerly Coordinator for OCLC Services at MINITEX.

Jutta Reed-Scott, who is working with us on several OMS projects, on the North American Collections Inventory Project, and other major efforts that you will be hearing about later this morning.

And, last, but certainly not least, Robert Molyneux, who has just gone to work at the University of Virginia with Kendon Stubbs. Bob is working part-time with the Committee on ARL Statistics on various matters related to the statistics program of the Association.

I am happy to report that I now consider the Association fully staffed.

In an ARL Newsletter that was mailed to your offices last Friday, we reported in some detail on legislative activities at the end of this last congressional session. I will not take the time to relate the details, but I will say that in my opinion the library programs embodied in federal legislation fared fairly well, but not brilliantly, considering the environment these days in Washington. We held our own. In the case of the National Endowment there was a cut, as there were in other programs. There followed an across-the-board cut decided upon by Congress. Nobody singled out the library programs—nobody but the Administration, and they unsuccessfully—for special cuts. So we are at about the same place we were last year at this time when I reported to you; factoring in inflation we are losing money, but not as fast as we might if Congress deliberately set out to do us in.

The best news that I have for you is very recent. Last Friday afternoon, October 19, President Reagen signed a bill granting independence to the National Archives and Records Service and separating it from the General Services Administration. Robert Warner and his staff are extremely happy about this, as are librarians, historians, and other scholars who use the National Archives and have been working hard for this outcome for several years. Dr. Warner asked me to tell you all once again that he is very grateful for all the efforts that ARL directors have made to ensure that the NARS independence bill passed. I understand that Dr. Warner is about to begin a new career also. He said he was going to stay in Washington until he separated the National Archives from the GSA and that is exactly what he did.

MR. DOUGHERTY (University of Michigan): I am pleased to announce that the Regents of the University of Michigan announced Bob Warner's appointment as the new Dean of the Library School. He will start in June 1985.

MS. ECHELMAN: There speaks the acting dean.

Just a few more items. The Salary Survey questionnaires are all in. Information processing is on time, and we expect that the Salary Survey will be out by the end of 1984. Preliminary tables will be prepared and sent to you just as soon as we can get them done.

The statistics questionnaires, however, seem to be coming in more slowly than usual, and we are a little bit concerned that this might delay the publication of the ARL Statistics. Please check with your staff members who are involved in putting together the statistics questionnaire to make sure that they get them to us as quickly as they possibly can so that we do not fall behind in the publication schedule, because I know that you are all anxious to get the final product.

The International Federation of Library Associations, as you all know, will be holding its 1985 meeting in Chicago. Representing ARL, I am a member of the Organizing Committee, and I am also chairing the Finance Committee. Earlier this year, in my capacity as Chairman of the IFLA Finance Committee, I circularized all institutional members of IFLA, many of whom are ARL libraries, asking for contributions to help cover the costs of the 1985 Conference. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of you who managed to find money somewhere, either in your budgets or in some special funds, to demonstrate that the American academic library community supports holding an international conference on librarianship in Chicago. We have about $30,000 in contributions from the institutional members, which is much more than the Organizing Committee expected.

Finally, on November 11-14, 1984, the American Council on Education (ACE) and the National Association of State, University, and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) will hold their first joint meeting, in Denver. On Monday afternoon of that week, there will be a session on research libraries. We have learned recently that the speakers for that session will be Warren J. Haas, Patricia Battin, and Martin Cummings. The ACE/NASULGC meeting is attended by chief academic officers, by deans, provosts, and presidents of the constituent institutions. This session is the first time that either ACE or NASULGC have addressed research libraries in a major session during a conference. I urge you to talk with those academic officers who are going to Denver, if you yourself are not going, to suggest that they attend that session.

Does anyone have any questions or comments on my report or anything I have said this morning? If not, I will turn the podium back over to Eldred.

Report on the Proposed North American Retrospective Conversion Project

MR. SMITH: The next item on the agenda is a report on the Proposed North American Retrospective Conversion Program from Joe Rosenthal, chair of the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control.

MR. ROSENTHAL (University of California, Berkeley): As part of the five-year plan of action, the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control has taken major responsibility for exploring the topic of a coordinated North American Retrospective Conversion Program, and working towards a plan for that program. Documentation has been made available to you. I am not sure all of you have received part of it. The summary of recommendations from the Spring Hill

Conference*, which I will talk about in a minute, is available here [see Appendix B] and the full proceedings of that conference have been sent to all members of ARL, but fairly recently, so some of you may not have received them.

In looking at retrospective conversion, the committee has identified a number of elements in a rationale for such a program. The objective would be to work towards a North American database which would serve as the basis for other important programs that ARL has taken on, maximizing the information resources of the research library community. The resulting database would be available for sharing resources and would serve as a basis for a North American preservation program, it would support scholarship and research, and, along the way, it would maximize the resources being spent, already and in the future, on retrospective conversion. In doing this, we would build a database that would meet desirable standards of quality and consistency.

There is a great deal of retrospective conversion going on now. But much of that work is characterized by duplication, that is, records for the same materials are being created in various places by various libraries, and not all of the records being created meet desirable standards of quality and consistency.

In looking at all of this, the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control has had a good deal of assistance from the Council on Library Resources and the Library of Congress, as well as from the ARL staff. I will give you a brief rundown of what has happened since the last ARL meeting.

The Council on Library Resources organized a conference in mid-July at Spring Hill, just outside of St. Paul, Minnesota, consisting of about 30 people. The conference was really in two parts over 2-1/2 days. There was a series of general sessions and small group discussions on the general topic of retrospective conversion, followed by a day and a half or so of primarily a group of music librarians—with some carry over from the first group—who dealt with the topic of retrospective conversion of music and materials about music. From that conference, the proceedings and the summary of recommendations, which you either have received or will receive soon, emanated.

As a result of that conference and the recommendations stemming therefrom, the Committee on Bibliographic Control met on September 7, to work toward various aspects of the recommendations that came out of the conference. That meeting was followed by consideration of the topic by the ARL Executive Committee and a discussion on October 24 with the ARL Board, which in turn was followed by a lengthy discussion of the topic and further planning by the Bibliographic Control Committee at its meeting yesterday.

We are now at the point of seeking funds, and have a proposal in hand to conduct a three-month study on this topic. The study should result in a rather detailed plan for a coordinated retrospective conversion program. The study will not answer all of the questions, but it will look towards setting up the machinery for such a program.

---

* Retrospective Conversion; report of a meeting sponsored by the Council of Library Resources, July 16-18, 1984, Wayzata, Minnesota. Compiled and edited by Dorothy Gregor. Washington, D.C., Bibliographic Services Development Program, Council on Library Resources, 1984.

As a result of the study and of work that the Library of Congress is already engaged in, there should be, by the conclusion of the study, a standard for retrospective conversion records that will have been reviewed in this organization by the Bibliographic Control Committee and the ARL membership, and will also have been reviewed by other organizations that are involved in technical services as well as other aspects of librarianship.

The study will look at the scope of records to be converted. The working premise is that it will deal essentially with monographic records and will attempt to define at least the range of the number of records to be converted. It will look at the involvement of Canadian libraries and libraries that are not members of the Association of Research Libraries, but that have collections that should be included in a national database for the purposes of research and scholarship. The study will look at questions of authority control, of overlap among existing files and databases, of the feasibility of linked systems for building an effective and available North American database, at the question of maintenance of bibliographic records and maintenance of files, at the economic impact of the program, and of available and potential sources for funding of such a program.

As an immediate outcome of the work that has been done in the past few days—and the person who has been actually doing most of the work on this is Jutta Reed-Scott—a brief survey will be distributed in mid-November on recon activity: what ARL libraries have done and are planning to do in the way of retrospective conversion. Because the survey instrument is brief, we will expect a prompt and full return, so please treat it with appropriate urgency when you receive it.

That, in brief, is a report of progress. I would be pleased to try to respond to questions and points of concern that you may have.

MR. BRECHT (University of Southern California): Could you repeat the target date for the final report of the study?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Assuming that there will be funding for the three-month study, the study will officially begin in January and would be completed by the end of March. Toward the end of that time, we expect that the Bibliographic Control Committee will have a draft for review and comment.

MS. BRYNTESON (University of Delaware): My question is just to clarify the use of terms. Retrospective conversion means, I believe, what the committee is dealing with, which is building a resource database. Is that correct?

MR. ROSENTHAL: That is correct.

MS. BRYNTESON: So that we actually will retrospectively convert 100 times throughout the nation, or however many. Is that correct?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I did not catch that last sentence, Susan.

MS. BRYNTESON: You are talking about building the one record, the resource database, and we all would use that resource database 100 or 150 different times. Is that correct?

MR. ROSENTHAL: It would be a database that could be and presumably would be used for multiple purposes; that is, it could be used as an information basis for preservation efforts, it could be used for interlibrary loan, it would serve as a database of acceptable quality that could be used by other libraries for their own retrospective conversion.

MS. BRYNTESON: I understand that, but, before it could be used for interlibrary loan, for example, it would require location symbols and that requires all of us using the resource database. What I want to understand is whether the committee talking only about the resource database or is it talking about also how the various ARL membership might apply its location symbols to that database?

MR. ROSENTHAL: The committee is primarily concerned with the former at this stage and, in speaking to a program that could involve subsidization through financial support of a retrospective conversion program, the committee has proceeded on the premise that subsidization would occur only for records of acceptable quality newly added to the national database. At this point, that file was conceived of as existing of several component parts; that is, the OCLC database, the RLIN database, the Library of Congress MARC files, and more to be explored. The premise at this point is that the files would be available in an open system through the Linked Systems Project.

MR. WELSH (Library of Congress): May I just add a comment to some concerns here. We would like to assume the responsibility of distributing the database as it is generated and, as Joe said, it would be available wherever it might find itself resident—OCLC, RLIN, or anyplace else—to be made available to everybody. Even Harvard might get it.

(Laughter.)

I have one other comment that is almost irrelevant. Yesterday, while I was discussing this proposal with Henriette Avram, I heard of some approach by some of the people who are librarians that we might be working toward AACR-III. As long as I am Deputy Librarian of Congress, there will be no hardbound copy of AACR-III.

A MEMBER: Long live Bill Welsh.

(Laughter.)

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania State University): Joe, what do we do about all of those institutions which have already converted their catalogs? Is that in the document we just received? My university has—and I know many others have, too—converted its records to machine-readable form. Is there an implication here that those would have to be redone?

MR. ROSENTHAL: It depends on how good your conversion process was, sir.

(Laughter.)

MR. FORTH: Okay. But having done them, let us say, and the institution is satisfied with them, then the next question would be whether they are up to the inclusion in the national database; is that it?

MR. ROSENTHAL: One of the questions in the survey that will be coming to you asks: What records have you converted? There will be an attempt to find out in the study what acceptable records, that is, acceptable in terms of quality according to the standard that is going to be worked on, exist—where are they and what libraries have converted? So the study will attempt to measure the conversion already done.

MR. FORTH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY (University of Missouri): Joe, following up a little bit on Stuart's question, in view of the fact that many of us are already pretty far into retrospective conversion. Given the state of development that we are in, are there arguments against a coordinated approach? I suspect the committee is in favor of a coordinated approach but have you solicited a contrary view and what are the arguments against coordination at this stage of the game?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I believe your question implies one of the chief points that was discussed at some length at the Spring Hill Conference and subsequently. A great deal of work has already been done, why attempt now to do a national program? I believe the response, the opinion of the committee and, eventually, the consensus achieved at Spring Hill, was that it is worth looking at a program for a North American Program because: a) there are a lot of items not in the files, a lot of records that are not converted, including some of the files in manual form representing very rich collections, widely dispersed; b) despite the work that has been done and is going on at a very rapid pace, a lot of it is duplicative; and c) at least some of that work is not up to an acceptable standard that will meet the other purposes for scholarship, for research, for preservation, for getting at shared resources. These reasons together constitute a rationale for doing the study and seeing what exists, what does not exist, and whether a program, then, is desirable.

The results of the study should be reviewed by this organization at some length and as fully as possible before we launch into a program.

MR. VASSALLO (University of New Mexico): In addition to converting existing manual records, has any thought been given to eliminating existing backlogs for which records do not exist?

MR. ROSENTHAL: That is another aspect of the committee's work. It is not specifically germane to the topic of retrospective conversion, but it certainly is part of the charge that the committee has taken responsibility for in the ARL Five-Year Plan of Action, that is, a program, a coordinated program for handling current cataloging. I would assume that the backlogs would fit into that aspect of our bibliographic control responsibilities, as opposed to retrospective conversion, even though the records emanating may be for older materials. I would treat that as part of a program to get control of current materials.

MR. FORTH: One other thing that I must ask before I go back and face my colleagues. Let us say that one's records meet the high standards of the effort. Are you talking about retrospective input, that is we go back and deposit our tapes? If so, would there be charges for this?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I do not know the answer to those questions, Stuart. That kind of question needs to be addressed, but I do not have an answer at this point.

MR. FORTH: So far that has not been done.

MR. ROSENTHAL: No, that has not been done.

MR. FORTH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DOUGHERTY: You have used the term "national database" and then when you described it, you broke it into pieces. I wonder if you would share with us what you see happening conceptually. How would this process work as envisioned by the committee?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I am not sure what you mean by the process.

MR. DOUGHERTY: What happens to the record from the time someone somewhere keys it? Where does it move? How is it going to be made accessible equally to the community?

MR. ROSENTHAL: There are several possibilities. One is that the record goes into an existing file, let's say OCLC, and is made available not only to members of OCLC but to other libraries as well, in the fairly near future, through the Linked Systems Project.

Another possibility—and these are not necessarily mutually exclusive and I am rapidly getting out of my technical depth—is that the records would be submitted to the Library of Congress. That might or might not occur through the machine-readable mode that is going to be responsible for producing the National Union Catalogue. The Library of Congress then makes these records available through a distribution system along the lines of MARC records. Those resultant records could be added to any of the utility files and might be available elsewhere for local systems as well. This process certainly is not clearly delineated at this point.

A MEMBER: Does that process not have to be delineated?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, it needs to be more clearly delineated than it is now, but there are a number of unknowns. We are at the beginning of the operational phase of the Linked Systems Project, which is going up at this point for authority records only. So there is clearly work to be done.

MR. WELSH: May I suggest that those of you who have not done it, read the report that was given to you in advance. The recommendations are on page 111 and following; but there are quite a few. It is very, very preliminary. I did not know anything more about this until yesterday when I queried Henriette Avram as to where she stood and I asked the same questions that are being asked now.

This committee does not have the answers to the questions, certainly, that Dick just asked. I urge patience. Can we agree upon the concept of developing a national database? If we can agree upon that concept, then we can proceed. There are a host of questions.

What we are trying to do—apparently what they are trying to do; I am not a part of the committee—is trying to develop the standard for the elements to be included in the database, some sort of standard agreement on the author heading and the subject heading. The author heading would be relatively straightforward. Subject headings requires conformance with LC subject headings and MESH. To mesh those, if you will excuse the expression, is going to be difficult in itself.

But I urge patience. This is an ambitious undertaking. More questions are unanswered than are answered.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Bill.

Shirley reminds me the proceedings of the conference were mailed last Friday. They are fairly voluminous but they certainly deserve your attention and that of your staff.

MS. MARTIN (Johns Hopkins University): I have been urged to make my views known. I believe the idea of a study is excellent. Has the committee talked at all about including in that study, brief as it is, an identification of the types of collections which have not been converted retrospectively, and this goes back to a couple of concerns that were voiced earlier. I would like to link that to the kind of financial effort and the source of the finance that we might be talking about ultimately, if we talk about a joint, a cooperative effort.

MR. ROSENTHAL: The survey instrument will attempt to identify collections held by ARL member libraries, and there will be a follow-up to that presumably to identify collections held elsewhere that are valuable for consideration in a North American bibliographic database. The identification of such files representing valuable collections is certainly something to be considered in the subsidization. I am not sure that I can be any more precise than that, Sue.

MR. EDELMAN (Rutgers University): I did read the report and was a little worried about the enormous implications of the phrase that says that this has to be a North American project rather than an international project. I wonder what led to—what seemed arrogant to me—the notion that we can solve the world's bibliographic problems all between ourselves here.

I would urge that the committee take into consideration in building the national database that there very well may be substantial international or foreign databases, for that matter, which conform to substantially the standards that are being set thanks to the many international efforts. There are, notably in Europe, substantial databases, substantial retrospective conversion projects taking place, and I would urge that we try to divide the responsibility rather than to try to duplicate that effort.

MR. ROSENTHAL: That is a very interesting point, Hank. Doing that and including that in the framework of the study that is contemplated for the January to March period or even beyond adds a raft of complexities to the project. Even including the Canadian libraries builds in some fair amount of further complexity and while the goal of looking at existing databases wherever they may reside is, in the abstract, very worthy, it presents real logistical difficulties in not only getting data on what is available but of working with that data to do a coordinated program.

I would be very hesitant about expanding the scope, but certainly your idea is worth consideration.

MR. SHANK (University of California, Los Angeles): I am sure everyone will assume that I am speaking from a vested interest. I am interested in your concept of a national database or an international database, Hank. That is fine. There should be one, at least to provide records that we can use for a variety of purposes. You had better hurry up because we are all really aging rapidly on this one. There are more options and alternatives every day for getting records that we can use locally, and everyone seems to talk about the wonders of distributed systems so that we can do things locally, which would suggest that there is less utility in a national database—except for pulling records in locally—than we might expect.

A question, though. There is one database which has something like 11 million records in it—that is the OCLC database—and I understand that there would not be that much new material. That is, the overlap would be quite high between the OCLC database and the RLIN database, so we do not gain too much in terms of new records there. But we have one database that has 11 million records and 180 million locations for 4,000 libraries in the United States and Canada and will, indeed, have some input from foreign libraries. To me that is a national union catalog.

Now, maybe there is, in addition, something that is required of it, and that is to recognize its national importance with the prospects of having some more open access to be gotten at relatively easily, but at cost at least because it is not cheap. But I do ask the question: Is there a recognition that there is already a national union catalogue?

MR. ROSENTHAL: There is recognition of the size and the scope of the number of locations that exist in the OCLC database, as well as the RLIN database. One of the things that the study intends to address, and the committee has spent some time on this point, is trying to get an estimate of the records, the number of unconverted records, that are not in either the RLIN or the OCLC database, and that has been very difficult.

MR. SHANK: But you want to get those from libraries which, in general, are operating in one of several—I hate to call them utilities but that is an easy word to use: OCLC, RLIN, UTLAS, a few others. So that is where you do get the records. But each of those has a technique for getting input and for charging for input in order to support the whole operation. So you think that linked systems of all of those is the important way to create a national database?

MR. ROSENTHAL: That seems to be one of the most plausible existing prospective modes of getting access to all of the records, at this point, yes.

MR. SHANK: Yes. Then I would submit that, while the protocols for the building of access are important, we should, indeed, all be working along the same lines, the same two-pronged plugs and the same 120 volt 60 cycle current and so on up to the MARC database. That is important. The technical problems of putting together the telecommunications and environment and running the software to make it work are probably a little more difficult than you have suggested in the fact that you would think that soon there would be a linked systems working.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Linked systems for bibliographic records are not technically available right now but the linked systems operating mode for authority records is at the point of going up.

MR. SHANK: For a limited number of libraries for purposes that they themselves will determine. Some of us have linked authority control systems. Many do not have authority control system online. The only point that I am making is that it is far more difficult, and I hope that the committee will take this into account, to get the operation going than it is to re-up on the protocols, which is hard enough.

MR. ROSENTHAL: A point well taken. One of the difficult subjects that the study must address and the program must address is the tackling of authority control, and it is not clear what the best mode for achieving consistency and acceptable authority control is going to be. In part, the committee has felt—that is, I believe most of the committee has felt—that economically it may be very desirable to try to rationalize and achieve consistency of authorities, both name and subject authorities, through post facto passing of records through an authority control mechanism and, at least in some aspects, this is technically feasible and is being done to a limited extent. It is an area that is important and difficult.

MR. BISHOP (University of Georgia): The important focus of this is to convert records that have not been converted, to convert them using accepted standards, and to make those records widely available to all libraries. I do not believe a particular technology is implied. I do not believe one needs linked systems. It may be magnetic tapes that we use, or whatever technology is available, and I believe it certainly builds on what we have already done—OCLC and RLIN databases and any other efforts.

MR. LEINBACH (Tulane University): Maybe this is my lack of technical understanding, Joe, but tell me again, why do we need to spend time working on a standard, given we have MARC standards, CONSER standards, and so forth?

MR. ROSENTHAL: The basic reason is that in current cataloging, and that lies behind the MARC standard, you have something in hand that you are cataloging. With retrospective conversion, most of the time you do not have a book in hand, you are working from a manual catalog record, and there are questions of what to include from that manual cataloging record and whether the manual cataloging record meets a standard that is acceptable and useful for the other purposes, for the purposes of shared resources, for the purposes of identification of the edition in hand, etc. It turns out that, at this time, there are two or three or four different kinds of guidelines—standards, if you will—for libraries and systems that are engaged in retrospective conversion, and those varying guidelines are not identical. The Library of Congress has indicated that it believes it can develop an acceptable standard within a fairly short period of time that would be acceptable to all those engaged in retrospective conversion. We will see.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I recognize that anybody that gets up here and speaks on this topic cannot avoid the accusation of vested interest, so I apologize in advance. This is a complex and it is an important undertaking and I agree with Bill that we need to exercise patience. But in order to talk about a coordinated undertaking that is going to require deployment of resources locally, in order to fit into some national plan, I believe it is important to highlight something that is stated on page 117 of these recommendations.

Recommendation Number 6 begins: "It is important that any institution choosing to participate in the coordinated recon program agree to produce and share records according to agreed-upon standards." It would seem to me that what is implied is that before we actually begin to operate any strategy there must be a pre-agreed arrangement to share not authority records but bibliographic records.

MR. ROSENTHAL: I believe that is important.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I believe it is absolutely essential that an agreement be reached.

MR. ROSENTHAL: But an agreement may not carry with it at the time the agreement is reached, or the understanding or the commitment to share records may not necessarily carry with it the mechanism in place to do this. There are two elements to this. One is the understanding that participants in a coordinated program would view the records as available to the research library community, and the other is developing and putting in place the mechanism by which this is done.

Further questions? Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much, Joe. I can only observe that conversion has always been a rather complex and mystical experience. And requires a good deal of faith, among other things. We look to the study to help lead us from darkness into light, I presume.

Report of the Committee on Collection Development

MR. SMITH: The next report is on the North American Collections Inventory Project, and it will be combined with a report on actions by our Committee on Collection Development.

MR. MILLER (University of Notre Dame): If retrospective conversion requires faith, I guess the virtue of the North American Collections Inventory Project, at this point, is hope.

There has been a lot written that you have seen about the inventory, and I am not going to go into a long history of it. I would remind you all that it is an official ARL program that evolved in four phases. The first, a preliminary phase, involved some testing. Phase 1 involved developing some materials; that was completed at the end of 1983. Phase 2, conducted in 1984, was a test in Indiana amongst Purdue, Indiana University, and Notre Dame of the materials and some strategies in training programs.

Phase 2 is just about complete and has been, from Notre Dame's perspective and, I believe, from OMS and ARL's perspective, successful. We have individually and institutionally learned much. We have in place a mechanism for cooperation and we are expecting to complete beyond the test commitments the entire conspectus within 18 months of January 1985. Phase 3 of the program is the expansion of the inventory to, we hope, all ARL libraries. The Board and the Committee on the Management of Research Library Resources have approved a proposal to seek funding for Phase 3.

Overall, the committee has spent a lot of time going over drafts of proposals from OMS on the inventory, has reviewed progress among the various test libraries, and is convinced, I believe, that the inventory is a very important base for cooperation among research libraries—not just in collection development but in retrospective conversion, in preservation, and in many other kinds of activities that are our life's work. We expect to have a full report on the Indiana Project for you at the end of this year or early next year, and are looking forward to the expansion of the inventory to all of you.

At this point there are two major groups already working on the inventory: the University of California system, and a number of libraries in the Southeast. The concept of the inventory has been approved by the Canadian Research Association as a basis for cooperation amongst Canadian libraries. We would encourage to your attention the progress on the inventory and to your careful consideration of the benefits that will come to us individually and collectively from the completion of the inventory for as many libraries as possible.

The North American Collections Inventory Project is one of the major responsibilities of the ARL Committee on Collection Development. But we have some other responsibilities that we have not ignored. One of them is to monitor developments in foreign acquisitions. The previous Task Force on Collection Development grappled with this, the present committee has been grappling with it, and, as Shirley's report says, we do not have anything for you yet. We have begun a survey of groups that are interested in foreign acquisitions. We have some preliminary results, but all of the results are not in yet. One result is an indication of the importance of the Linked Systems Project for collection development, preservation, and bibliographic control to area studies and those interested in foreign collections. It is also very interesting that, despite the development and progress of the utilities, the area studies people still feel very strongly about the need for union lists. There will be more work done on the survey and a report will be issued after all the results are in.

A third area that the committee has begun looking at is what is called discriminatory pricing of journals, particularly pricing of foreign journals with separate pricing for the North American market. There is a lot of development over the past several years. The Board considered this matter briefly in Colorado Springs. The committee feels that it needs further study, work, and, we hope, action to discourage and stop what is going to have major impact on our budgets.

That is the extent of the report from the committee. I would be glad to answer any questions, if you have any.

Report of the Committee on ARL Statistics

MR. SMITH: I would now like to call upon Ted Johnson, chair of the Committee on ARL Statistics, for a report from that committee.

MR. JOHNSON (Emory University): Thank you, Eldred.

The Committee on ARL Statistics has operational responsibility to oversee the work of the ARL Annual Salary Survey and of the ARL Statistics. Shirley has mentioned both of those items. We are getting increasing numbers of responses every day, according to Bob Molyneux and Kendon Stubbs, on our supplemental questionnaires, and they are busy encoding that information and beginning the analysis so that we can produce a report as quickly as we can. We do ask that you please submit your responses, if you have not, as quickly as possible.

Along that same line, the Statistics Committee, which met yesterday with a packed agenda, has been involved with the Council on Library Resources. Martin Cummings joined with us in our meeting and participated in it, and we are working hard to share with each other information and studies that are of interest to us and to Dr. Cummings in the Economics Seminar Program. We plan to have some sort of a preliminary report, if possible, for that seminar, which will meet next in Washington in early November.

We are looking particularly at some of the information you are providing us in the supplemental questionnaire. I appreciate the comments that people have taken time to make about the questionnaire, some of the problems with it, and some of the areas that you find of particular interest. The responses vary quite a bit. It is very interesting to see that many libraries are able to answer virtually all of the questions with little comment or difficulty, while other libraries have difficulty with particular areas or sections; they simply have not kept or counted information in the ways that we asked. We need your ideas and suggestions along those lines and those comments are important. We do not plan to publish the supplementary statistics as a part of the ARL Statistics but we will share that information on a more informal basis with the membership for several years as we develop it before we integrate these data elements into the regular publications.

The other item that I wanted to call to your attention again is the manual on performance measures, Objective Performance Measures for Academic and Research Libraries, the red book which all of you received this past summer. I urge you to pass that out to members of your staff that are involved in statistics measurement planning, to try using those measures, and to report back to us on your experiences so that we can report to the membership as a whole about work on those performance measures.

If you have measures of various kinds or similar procedures that you believe are important in your libraries, suggestions you would like to make to the committee for consideration, we would like to know about them. I noted in Duane's report this morning about those options and models for the future, that one of the key factors that was identified by at least one group, if not more, was the lack of relevant performance measures that we can use as we develop our libraries and information systems in some of these new directions, taking account of electronic measures and other questions. The item also came up in the Board's discussions earlier this week. Should we be looking at measures concerning the efficiency of our operations, the speed of providing information and documents? We would like your comments and ideas along those lines.

The committee is working in a number of other areas as well. One of the things that we do intend to pursue in the coming weeks and months is the development of an ARL price index not unlike the higher education price index, so that we will have some additional information that would be helpful to us.

That concludes my formal report. I would be happy to entertain questions or comments, if there are any, on this or any other matters that you might have.

Election of New Board Members

MR. SMITH: The next item on the agenda is election of new Board members. I would like to call on Richard Talbot, who chaired the Nominating Committee.

MR. TALBOT (University of Massachusetts): The other members of the Nominating Committee were Susan Brynteson and John McDonald, and I would like to thank them for their assistance. We have nominated: Richard Chapin of Michigan State University; Margaret Otto of Dartmouth College; and Joseph Rosenthal of the University of California, Berkeley.

Thank you very much. I will turn it back to you, Eldred.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Richard. Are there any further nominations? (No response.) Is there a motion for a unanimous ballot?

MR. WYATT (University of Rochester): I so move.

MR. KUHN (Iowa State University): I second the motion.

MR. SMITH: Those in favor, please say "aye."

(A chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, "no."

Congratulations. Your first benefit from this will be to attend this afternoon's Board meeting.

Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries

MR. SMITH: The next item on the agenda is discussion of Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts. I would like to call on the chair of the Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials, Margaret Otto.

MS. OTTO (Dartmouth College): I believe all of you by now have had an opportunity to review the document "Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries," [see Appendix C], so I do not want to review that document in detail. I would like to give you a sense of the chronology in the development of these guidelines.

In looking at the 1984 goals for our committee and for the ARL organization, it was determined by the Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials that none would be more important than developing these minimum guidelines for ARL libraries. The committee was very happy when David Weber volunteered to draft the first run at these guidelines, and he did so in June of 1983.

By the October 1983 session of the Preservation Committee, the committee members had had an opportunity to review the first draft and to share it with the appropriate members of their staff. This seemed to be a viable route. But before presenting it to the membership, we wanted the document to have further exposure. So ten libraries of varying size and preservation backgrounds were identified and the document was sent to those ten libraries for comments and suggestions. The committee then reviewed the draft in light of the comments we received, and the document was approved by the committee as the document we would like to see moved towards adoption by ARL. The document was forwarded to the ARL Board for discussion and review, and was sent then to the membership at large.

In terms of the document itself, I want to stress that these are guidelines. They are not regulations. They are not intended to be regulations. They are not intended to be points in the accrediting process for libraries. We see this as a flexible document, one that should change over time. The comments that we received suggested that perhaps, in some instances, we had not gone far enough. Some respondents would have liked us to increase the percentage of dollars expended on preservation or to have added elements. One respondent believed we should add an element such as a necessity for preservation officers in the various libraries. The committee believes that at this time the need is having a document in hand that we can work with and change over the course of time as the environment changed. At this point I would like to recommend that ARL approve the document as presented to you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Margaret. There is a motion on the floor from the chair of the committee to approve the "Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries" that were drafted by the Preservation Committee. That motion, coming from a committee chair, requires no second. The proposal was reviewed by the Board and comes forward to this meeting with the Board's endorsement.

The floor is open for discussion.

MR. LUCKER (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I am prepared to support this set of guidelines. At yesterday's meeting of the Committee on the Management of Research Library Resources, however, we raised a question about the item 2, which has to do with statistics. While we recognize the desirability of collecting this data, there is some question in our minds as to whether it is economically feasible to propose in a set of guidelines that this data be collected. I am prepared to vote for this with the understanding that additional consideration will be given to this area. I believe that the program will not work if we all do not do more or less the same thing, know how many libraries already collect this data and how much effort would have to be made to collect it. There may be much more than any of us can undertake.

MS. OTTO: That is a valid point, Jay, and the committee has looked at that. Our belief is that, although we have identified certain areas where we would like statistics to be kept, we do not believe that we should have the final say, so to speak. We would like to work with the Statistics Committee in developing more appropriate definitions for the elements, and also in determining just what areas we should be keeping statistics in, so we would have consistent recordkeeping.

MR. JOHNSON: As chair of the Committee on ARL Statistics, and also an attendee of the Management Committee meeting yesterday, I have talked with Margaret about this particular area. One possible approach we have identified is that there would be various kinds of much more detailed statistics that libraries might want to keep, or that preservation staffs would need to keep, for their own management and working purposes, some of which are perhaps suggested in this document, and that there may be other kinds of data that might be collected on a more general or simple basis that are shared among ourselves or through the ARL Statistics. I believe there is a distinction between some of the general statistics that we collect and publish on a regular basis and use for various general purposes—education, public relations, etc.—on our campuses and the kinds of data we need for basic working and management areas. We were going to try to work with that together. I do not believe that the recommendation here is intended to say that we are approving, if we approve this document today, a certain set of detailed statistics that are going to be kept on a regular basis. We also see that publication of data like this might be done on an informal occasional basis, through survey reports and things of that nature, rather than as part of the regular Statistics.

MR. PETERSON (Southern Illinois University): I believe it is a very good statement and, as Jay said, I certainly am prepared to support it. I do not know whether it is relevant to be in the Guidelines, but I would hope that there would be a recognition in terms of ARL's interest, perhaps in section 3 on national participation, in the regional activities that are being supported at the present time by a number of agencies including the National Endowment of Humanities and the Council on Library Resources. These are multi-state initiatives and are going forth with conservation efforts, both training efforts and, in some cases, actual treatment efforts. I would hope that we would see these as part of a larger national configuration and give recognition to them in the Guidelines that we are setting forth.

MS. OTTO: I do not think the committee would have any problem with adjusting our recommendations at some point to include that specifically, but I believe that the intent of the Guidelines certainly encompasses that kind of thinking.

MR. SMITH: Is there any further discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favor, please say "aye."

(A chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, "no."

Thank you, Margaret. It has been suggested to me that preservation surely must be charity—

(Laughter.)

—since we have already covered faith and hope.

Report of the Office of Management Studies

MR. SMITH: The next item on the agenda is a report from the Director of the Office of Management Studies, Duane Webster.

MR. WEBSTER: I am glad Eldred made clear that this is not the charitable part of the program. A written report on recent office activities is available on the table outside the room. [See Appendix D.] I would like to use the time available this morning to talk about the plans and prospects for the office in the next year or so.

First, the General Electric Foundation grant supporting the Public Services Studies and Research Projects draws to a close at the end of this year. The reports from the seven pilot studies and the seven research projects will be available to members before the year is out; some already are available. A fuller report on this project is expected at the spring meeting. We are now prepared to operate Public Services Self Studies at member libraries on a cost recovery basis. An inquiry of ARL directors this last summer indicated that at least 20 libraries are interested in looking at the Public Services Study process. Exploratory visits to four members earlier this fall set the groundwork to begin studies at those institutions shortly.

Secondly, I want to report on the Council on Library Resources support for an Institute on Research Libraries for Library School Faculty, which was conducted this past summer. Materials covering the agenda, the format, the speakers, participants, as well as the results of that institute are available to anybody who would like them. To avoid repeating the detail that is in those reports, let me simply say that the institute appeared successful in meeting the goals that were set up for it. Faculty were interested and willing to participate and they thought the institute was informative and useful. The field visit libraries—North Carolina State University, the University of North Carolina, and Duke University—were pleased to host the faculty and, by all accounts, they provided rich experiences to the participants. Also, we were able to attract a blue ribbon panel of seminar speakers, whose comments were well received.

The success of this first institute prompted us to propose to the Council that they support at least one and possibly two additional institutes. That proposal was submitted to the Council and we expect to hear their reaction shortly. If we do secure funding, I will turn again to several of you to help put together the program and the field visits.

The third item concerns the National Endowment for the Humanities award of a two-year grant of $65,000 to support the conduct of the Preservation Planning Program at ten ARL member libraries. Fourteen members applied for these grants and, with the help of the ARL Committee on Preservation, the choices were made in the last two weeks. A press release announcing these choices is being prepared and will be distributed to you shortly. The libraries that will be participating in the program are the Center for Research Libraries, Colorado State University, Iowa State University, the University of Missouri at Columbia, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, the University of Oregon, the Smithsonian Institution, State University of New York at Stony Brook, and the University of Tennessee. Two of these studies will begin before the end of the year, the second group of four will start in the spring, and the third group of four will begin in the fall of 1985. Jutta Reed-Scott will be the principal staff person on those studies.

The fourth item relates to plans for a second management institute for ARL directors scheduled for February 20-23, 1985. This institute will build on the first one, held last spring, and will cover the topics of strategic planning, the role of the library in the university, and organizational change. The institute will be held here in Washington, D.C., and all of those who have expressed interest in that program will be notified.

A fifth item concerns a new analytical skills institute for research librarians which is being designed by OMS. This institute will provide training on the statistical problem-solving and quantitative skills that are required for success in academic libraries. Our plans call for two institutes to be held in 1985, one most likely in June and one in November. We will notify you as soon as those plans are complete, probably within the next two months.

I might add that Susan Jurow, the new Training Program Coordinator, is filling a key gap at OMS and will be helping with the design of this institute as well as the conduct of the institute for ARL directors. We have also announced our schedule for public management skills institutes scheduled for 1985.

A sixth item on my agenda this morning is the profile of automation activities of member libraries being readied for publication this winter. This is a new service, and it is based on an inventory of ARL members conducted this last summer. The resulting database has 94 contributions to date, and we have already started answering questions from this new file. One of the inquiries we have received, for example, is: How many ARL libraries presently have fully operational online catalog systems? The profile is reporting that as of October 1, 14 libraries have that capability. Maxine Sitts is the person with the operating responsibility for this project.

A seventh item relates to a proposal for the design of a technical services self study. This proposal has been reviewed by the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control and the ARL Committee on Management of Research Library Resources. With their support, we are now prepared to look for the financial support necessary to allow the development of that capability.

Finally, these project plans complement the continuing responsibilities generated by the core operating programs of OMS, namely, conduct of the self studies, operation of the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, and maintenance of the training programs. The status report provided at this meeting describes some of these core program activities, and the OMS staff are eager to talk more fully about these programs with you.

I will close this brief report by thanking again the ARL Committee on Management of Research Library Resources for their support in planning and advising on these activities.

Report of the ARL President

MR. SMITH: The next item on the agenda is the President's Report. I promise not to occupy very much time. I want to report very briefly, the major actions that were taken by the Board at this meeting, some of which have already been the topics of discussion earlier today.

The Board approved a recommendation from the Committee on Bibliographic Control for a planning study for a proposed North American coordinated retrospective conversion program.

The Board adopted a chronology for annual review of the ARL operating plan that effectively connects the planning process with the budget cycle and provides regular and substantive interaction between the Board and the committees and task forces who are charged to carry out various portions of that plan.

The Board augmented the charge to the Executive Committee to formalize its continuing role as the Association's finance committee, augmented in the sense of making specific that the Executive Committee would give specific continued attention to the budget.

The Board approved a recommendation to seek funding to build an inventory of North American research library collections, essentially Phase 3 of the Collections Inventory Project, on the basis of a proposal prepared by Jeff Gardner in consultation with the NCIP Advisory Committee.

The Board endorsed the "Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries" prepared by the Preservation Committee and, as we saw earlier, brought them forward for action at this meeting.

The Board had some fairly extended discussion with regard to progress of the Task Force on Scholarly Communication, met with the chair of that task force, Charles Osburn, at his request, and agreed to proceed in this area in the following way. I charged the staff working with the task force, and under the purview of the Executive Committee, to commission a qualified expert to prepare a working paper dealing with the present state and future directions in the cycle of scholarly communication, with particular emphasis on the present and future role of research libraries.

The Board agreed to participate in the ALA accreditation study and will submit nominees for that participation.

And, finally, with regard to new members, the Board is continuing the moratorium on new members and has asked the Statistics Committee to look at additional factors related to membership qualifications.

Finally, let me impose on your time for a few minutes to make some observations. My year as President of ARL has been a very rewarding one for me personally. It has been particularly satisfying to see the progress of the ARL plan, a plan that had its seeds in Jay Lucker's presidency, that took initial shape and established momentum under Penny Abell, and that was designed and begun under Jim Govan. I believe that the implementation of this plan is making and will continue to make a major contribution to the progress of research libraries and the scholarship that we support, as well as the value and centrality of the ARL in this process.

I want at this point to recognize the departure from the Board of two members: Jim Govan and Bill Studer. Both have made major contributions to the Association in their terms. Jim's contributions, of course, include his accomplishments as President.

I also want to thank the ARL staff, particularly Shirley Echelman, Duane Webster, and Nicola Daval. They are outstanding people and professionals. A great part of our very best accomplishment is due to them.

Finally, I want to thank you all. You are, after all, the ARL, not simply because you are the membership, but because, through our committee structure, so much of the direction and accomplishment in our organization depends on you. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve you.

Change of Officers

MR. SMITH: I now, with very mixed feelings, will relinquish the gavel and pass it along to Richard Talbot, who, I know, is going to do an absolutely outstanding job as President of the Association in this next year.

Dues Increase for 1985

MR. TALBOT: Is there any further business to come before this assembly?

MS. ECHELMAN: Yes, there is. We did not pass the dues increase.

MR. TALBOT: You all have received notice of the dues increase. That unpleasant subject comes before you now. It is a motion on the floor. Does anybody wish to raise any issues about the dues increase? Does anybody wish to pass the dues increase? All those in favor, please say "aye."

(A chorus of ayes.)

Thank you. Is there any further business to come before the assembly? Does anyone wish to make a motion to adjourn?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: So move.

MR. TALBOT: All those in favor, please say "aye." Thank you.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ACTIVITIES AND STATUS REPORT
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

May 1984 - October 1984

Staff and Office Activities

Staff turnover in both ARL and OMS has provided management with the opportunity to develop a more flexible organization structure, and to integrate the staffs of the Executive Office and the Office of Management Studies in a team approach to the accomplishment of the goals and objectives by the Association's Board and membership. A careful assessment of the strengths of current staff has been completed, and new staff members have been chosen to round out staff expertise. Duane Webster has been appointed Deputy Executive Director of ARL. Duane and I will share overall responsibility for programs, activities, and services of the association, and we have begun to improve our system for sharing information about staff activities and progress. In August, Jeffrey Heynen joined the ARL staff as Program Officer with responsibilities for the oversight of ARL activities in the areas of bibliographic control and preservation. Currently, Jeffrey is working on part-time basis as part of the ARL executive staff while he completes work on the ARL Microform Project. He will be full-time at his new position by the end of this year. The other two open positions on ARL's professional staff have also been filled. Jaia Barrett began work on October 18 as Program Officer with responsibilities for legislation and information policy development. Susan Jurow joined the staff in September as Training Program Specialist. Susan will have responsibilities in the area of staff development and training, and will work with the Executive Office in the areas of library education and professional training. Based upon the admittedly brief experience that we have had with our three new staff members, Duane and I both feel that the Association has been lucky in its choices.

Projects and Programs

North American Collections Inventory Project (NCIP) - Phase II

NCIP II has made satisfying progress along the lines expected during the last six months, under Jeffrey Gardner's direction. The three ARL Indiana libraries have completed the conspectus data for five major sections, and this information has been forwarded to RLG for entering into RLIN. All three libraries are continuing to work with the conspectus and expect to complete their work during 1985 and 1986. It is likely that approximately forty additional ARL libraries will join NCIP as participants during the year. In fact, the nine University of California Libraries began assessing their collections in July of this year, and thirteen ARL libraries in the Southeast have formally agreed to begin participation soon. In addition, the Canadian Association of Research Libraries will be considering participation in NCIP at their meeting on November 14-15. Jeff Gardner will meet with CARL to answer questions about the project and help in the assessment of participation.

ARL and RLG have discussed the conditions under which certain other libraries, such as the non-ARL CARL member institutions and some of the non-ARL land-grant university libraries, might join in the project. All indications are that RLG views these additions to the original agreement positively. David Farrell, Collection Development Officer at University of Indiana, has been appointed by ARL as liaison to the RLG Task Force on the Conspectus. He is bringing to the RLG Task Force problems and issues that arise and changes that are suggested by non-RLG participants in NCIP. This process has developed admirably into a cooperative endeavor in which the concerns of non-RLG libraries are given prompt and serious consideration. Several changes initiated by NCIP participants have been approved by the RLG Task Force and are already being implemented. Among these are new guidelines for the chemistry section which will provide a precedent for resolving some earlier concerns about the validity of the science conspectus. Similarly, the Clearinghouse for Verification Studies has been established at OMS and should play a major role in assisting in the validation of inventory rankings. For example, the Indiana libraries are preparing verification studies in three subject areas, and we fully expect that as more libraries participate, many additional studies will be developed and added to the clearinghouse.

A report on NCIP will be presented by the Chairman of the ARL Committee on Collection Development, Robert Miller, at the October 25 Business Meeting.

The Conser/A&I Coverage Project

As of September 30, seventy-six abstracting and indexing services have agreed to participate in the project. These services are contributing title lists for 118 different indexes and abstracts totaling nearly 100,000 titles. The A&I services that have agreed to contribute their title lists have also agreed to maintain title coverage information by reporting changes either to the Library of Congress or to the National Library of Canada. There are still some outstanding invitations to participate, and it is expected that the project will exceed 100,000 titles by April of 1985.

OCLC has completed the searching and addition of index notes for 50,000 titles. They are processing 10,000 titles a month, and are expected to complete their contract work in February of 1985. Over 40,000 unique CONSER records have been identified as a result of the OCLC work. Most of the project staff's work is in the area of record enhancement; ISSNs, key titles, and abbreviated key titles are being added, as necessary, to titles handled by the project. During the course of work, it has been discovered that only seven percent of the titles were identified as having no matches in the OCLC database. A closer examination of the lists and further consultations with the A&I services is reducing that percentage.

The Project Manager, Julia Blixrud, is working with OCLC to develop specifications for the production of title lists for the A&I services from CONSER records. Each participating service will receive a list of its titles sometime next spring, and these lists will be the basis for the continuing maintenance of the A&I information. The Project Manager and the Project Advisory Committee will meet early in 1985 to consider the steps that will be necessary to wind the project up and institute procedures to insure the continuance of updating after the project itself comes to an end.

Office of Management Studies

The Office of Management Studies continues to be actively involved in organizational studies, collection analysis, training institutes and the collection and dissemination of information on ARL library operations and procedures. In addition activity in three special areas have received emphasis: the preservation planning program has been extended with the awarding of a 2-year grant by the National Endowment for the Humanities; work continues on the Public Services Project funded by the General Electric Foundation; and the Institute on Research Libraries for Library Educators which was held in Chapel Hill during mid-July has now been evaluated and the final report sent to the Council on Library Resources. Along with this report a proposal has been submitted for two more institutes. The next Management Institute for ARL Directors will be held February 20-23, 1985. A detailed report on OMS activities will be distributed at the October Meeting.

ARL Microform Project

Preservation Component. Responses from the preservation questionnaire are still arriving at the project's office. As of late September, 110 responses have been received (of the 200 questionnaires distributed). Approximately two dozen more returns are expected, all but 19 ARL members have responded as of September 30. Jeffrey Heynen and the Project Advisory Committee have been aware since the inception of this project that the questionnaire was both lengthy and very complex. Although the drafters took great pains to make the questionnaire as easy as possible to answer, and although the questionnaire asks only for data that were readily available, many respondents opted to take extraordinary care to respond fully, and are to be congratulated wholeheartedly on the efforts they made in this direction. Nevertheless there has been some frustration with length of the questionnaire, with the absence of readily available information for use in responding, and with the absence of a section separate from the comments page in which respondents could give a simple narrative statement of preservation activity in their institutions in place of full statistical data.

The majority of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated that the process of completing the survey was difficult but rewarding. For example, a number of respondents found that those responsible for completing the forms learned some things about their own preservation programs that they had not previously known, and in several instances there are indications that this information has directly resulted in institutional policy changes.

Preliminary analysis of the returns shows a surprisingly large investment in preservation by North American libraries, archives and historical societies. It also shows that preservation activity is only generally related to institution size or ARL ranking. A number of medium and small-sized libraries have programs that are quite strong, while some of the larger institutions are relatively inactive. Desire to participate in cooperative preservation microfilming activities is widespread, as is interest in the establishment of regional microfilming production facilities. It is now expected that the final report will be completed by the end of 1984, and will contain recommendations for action by the Association.

Bibliographic Component. Jeffrey Heynen continues to operate the Microform Cataloging Clearinghouse. Funds for the Clearinghouse are still available from the Mellon grant and it is expected that these funds will last until January or February of 1985. At its April 1984 meeting, the ARL Board decided to continue the operation of the project, using ARL's own funds for three years. During this time we will investigate an appropriate permanent home for the Microform Cataloging Clearinghouse. The operation continues to take about one day a week of staff time. Although the number of inquiries is now lower than it was in the early months of the Clearinghouse, the quality of the inquiries remains high; i.e., inquirers continue to request information for use in choosing projects from a list of high-priority microform sets in order to establish individual or cooperative cataloging efforts. In some cases these efforts are funded by grants and in others they are internally funded. In related activities, OCLC has produced a pamphlet describing the products that are available as a result of its development of profile matching and has continued to express enthusiasm for the goals of the project. In 1984, Stanford University received a grant from the Title II-C program which has enabled RLG to begin programming work so that profile matching will be available through the RLIN database. Coordinated cataloging of large microform sets is now a reality thanks to ARL efforts in this area and the cooperation of OCLC, RLG, and a number of other agencies. Thus, we are seeing the full fruition of an effort that began formally at ARL in 1979. While we cannot claim that all microform sets have been cataloged and that the data is readily available to all other libraries in machine-readable form, we can claim to have developed a mechanism for the successful solution of this major problem for academic and research libraries.

Publications

As many of you may know, there are three distinct publications programs in the Association's office: the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center at OMS, the publications program of the Center for Chinese Research Materials, and the publications program of the ARL Executive Office. One of the management matters that remains to be addressed is whether it would be efficient to combine some functional aspects of these programs. We will begin to investigate this issue seriously early in 1985.

Work on the 1983-84 Salary Survey is proceeding on schedule. Almost all questionnaires have been returned, and data processing and analysis has begun. I am assured by those involved with the Salary Survey that publication can be expected by the end of 1984. The ARL Statistics is progressing in somewhat the same manner. Although all the questionnaires have not yet been returned, we have begun to do the requisite checking and data entry and we expect to publish by the end of January 1985. The ARL publication Objective Performance Measures for Academic and Research Libraries appeared in June, and has been received with great enthusiasm. The publication was distributed to the participants in the Institute for Library Educators as well as to ARL Directors. At least one of the institute participants has adopted it as a text for one of his classes for the semester currently under way. Sales have been steady, and we expect to recover our costs for the manual, excluding the costs of distribution to ARL members, within the next six months. Among the comments most frequently made on the publication are that it is a model of clarity, and that anyone can use it with relative ease. Objective Performance Measures was written by Paul Kantor. Carol Mandel edited the publication and Nicola Daval was in charge of the production management. I would like to take this opportunity in my written report to thank all three for their very valuable contribution to the profession in this publication. There is every indication that Objective Performance Measures will be widely and, for the most part, favorably reviewed. We expect that it will become a minor bestseller in its own way.

Three issues of the ARL Newsletter have been published since the April Meeting, and the Minutes of the October 1983 Meeting have also been published and distributed to ARL libraries. We are experiencing some delay in the publication of the April 1984 Minutes, due to the highly technical nature of the presentations made by the major speakers, and the resultant extent of necessary editing. Nevertheless, we hope that the April 1984 Minutes will be published before the end of November.

ARL Plan: Progress Report

It was agreed by the Board of Directors in April that I would provide a status report on ARL Plan activities to the membership in October of each year. The format that we agreed upon was a checklist in which each task is listed under the objective to which it belongs. What follows is my first written report to the membership on the ARL Plan of Action.

Objective 1: To understand, contribute to, and improve the system of scholarly communication.

1984 List of Tasks

1. Explore thoroughly what other groups are doing in modeling and data gathering in this area. Comment: although some informal exploration has been undertaken by the ARL Task Force on Scholarly Communication, no thorough exploration has been completed.

2. Jointly sponsor ACLS Office of Scholarly Communication and/or initiate a planning meeting with other major discipline/education groups. Comment: the ACLS Office of Scholarly Communication has now been established with Herbert Morton as its Executive Director. This event occurred in September. ARL has strongly supported the establishment of this office and will continue to cooperate fully with OSC.

3. Develop conceptual model identifying elements needed in information base. Disseminate model for comment evaluation and publicity. Comment: no progress to be reported.

Objective 2: To make systems of access more effective for research libraries.

1984 List of Tasks

1. Continue work to make national collections inventory operational: negotiate agreements, test manuals, etc. Institute procedures and arrangements. Comment: work on the NCIP is progressing very satisfactorily as noted earlier in this report. The agreement with RLG to add the information to the RLIN database is operating. Manuals and worksheets have been tested, and we have instituted procedures for raising issues of concern about the conspectus with the RLG task force on the conspectus. Further work is being planned for 1985 as Phase III of NCIP.

2. Study role of LC in distributed cataloging environment. Comment: the Bibliographic Control Committee continues to study this issue; no recommendations are being made at the present time.

3. Develop ARL position paper on coordination of the distributed cataloging. Comment: Status is the same as for Number 2.

4. Develop ARL position paper on coordinated foreign acquisitions. Comment: the ARL Collection Development Committee continues to study this issue, but has no report to make at the present time.

5. Operate project to add A&I information to the CONSER database. Comment: see earlier section of this report. It is expected that the ARL project will be completed by April 1985.

6. Operate microforms cataloging clearinghouse. Comment: the clearinghouse is fully operational, current funding is being provided by the Mellon Foundation and funding for the next three years has been committed from ARL funds.

7. Begin planning for the agreements needed to share responsibilities in collection development, retrospective conversion, distributed cataloging, and preservation. Comment: several ARL committees and members of staff are involved in progress on this task. The NCIP project proceeds as the basis for shared responsibilities in collection development; at the request of the Bibliographic Control Committee and with the approval of the Executive Committee, ARL staff is developing a proposal for a planning study on the coordination of a national program for retrospective conversion. In addition, the Committee has prepared a resolution about the data entry requirements for retrospective conversion projects that are funded by either NEH or the Department of Education. This resolution has been reviewed by the ARL Executive Committee and has been discussed by the appropriate program officers at the National Endowment for the Humanities, and at the Title II-C Program. The Preservation Committee is considering a project which would increase the availability of preservation microfilming records.

Objective 3: To increase the number of member libraries engaged in programs to preserve their collections.

1984 List of Tasks

1. Design operating preservation programs appropriate for external funding. Comment: the Preservation Committee is discussing an options paper, but has not yet focused on a specific operating program. RLG and ARL's CCRM are developing a joint proposal for a coordinated project for Chinese materials.

2. Work to attract funds for preservation efforts. Comment: ARL staff has been working with the National Humanities Alliance to insure that preservation of research materials will be a prominent priority in the 1985 discussions leading to reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

3. Adopt guidelines for minimum preservation effort. Comment: Guidelines for minimum preservation efforts in ARL libraries were approved by the Preservation Committee at its meeting in June 1984, and have been distributed by mail to all ARL directors for discussion by the Board and at the Business Meeting on October 25.

5. Conduct preservation planning self-studies in ten ARL libraries. Comment: the National Endowment for the Humanities has provided funding for OMS to conduct ten additional preservation planning self-studies. Requests for proposals were sent to all ARL directors early in the summer, and the Advisory Committee to this project (the Preservation Committee) has just completed its review of the returned proposals.

6. Assist ARL libraries in training preservation staff. Comment: Training of preservation staff in ARL libraries is included in the proposal made to NEH under Number 5.

7. Develop a guide to preservation microfilming. Comment: the Guide to Preservation Microfilming for Libraries and Archives is in preparation; Andrew Raymond, the Associate Director of the Northeast Document Conservation Center, is the principal author. At this time, it is expected that a manuscript will be delivered to ARL by June 1985; ARL has the responsibility for publishing the guide.

Objective 4: To influence information policies that affect research libraries and their clientele.

Comment: As noted in the ARL Plan of Action, this Objective does not have a specific list of tasks on a year-by-year basis. In 1984 consultation, preparation of documentation and testimony, and other efforts were made in the areas of reauthorization and appropriations for the Higher Education Act, NEH Appropriations, and other legislation related to library programs. The Telecommunications Coalition has continued to be active, and ARL has provided information to its members from time to time on the status of issues related to telecommunications. A number of standards have been reviewed by the appropriate groups within ARL and comments submitted to the National Information Standards Organization (NISO). ARL was represented at meetings on the revision of Title 44 (GPO), unclassified controlled nuclear information materials from the Department of Energy, copyright, and other issues in the area of information policy.

Objective 5: To identify capabilities required for research library personnel, and to assist member libraries in the recruitment, development, and effective use of staff.

1984 List of Tasks

1. Complete the paper describing future staffing needs and issues in deployment; provide for wide distribution, solicit comment, and modify paper. Provide discussion at ARL Meeting. Comment: the program session of the October ARL Meeting is devoted to this issue, and documentation has been provided by the Task Force on Research Library Staffing.

2. Initiate institute on research library developments for library educators. Comment: Duane Webster, working with the Library Education Committee, developed and conducted this institute in July. Funding was provided by the Council on Library Resources. The final report on the first institute was presented to the funding agency and is available from OMS, and a proposal has been developed for additional institutes.

3. Continue all management skills workshops throughout the planning period. Comment: this is an ongoing activity of OMS. In addition, a management skills institute for ARL directors was held in February and two advanced management skills institutes were conducted in Australia in August.

4. Provide support for training and development in individual institutions on request, throughout the planning period. Comment: this is an ongoing activity of OMS.

5. Identify research needs to support the attainment of Objective 5 and promulgate the research agenda in library schools. Comment: no specific actions have been taken on this task, although it is expected that one of the outcomes of the small group discussions at the ARL meeting this October will be to identify needed research in the area of library staffing. The ARL Statistics Committee has produced a supplementary

questionnaire for the ARL membership; one of the questions currently being analyzed is whether we can get better information on the mix of staff in ARL libraries.

Objective 6: To assist member libraries in augmenting their management capabilities.

1984 List of Tasks

1. Continue to provide OMS self-study support on demand throughout the planning period. Comment: this is an ongoing activity.

2. Provide information and assistance to member libraries in the management of change throughout the planning period. Comment: this, also, is an ongoing activity.

3. Continue to provide and improve ARL statistics including adding data elements needed for management. Comment: the statistics and salary survey programs are ongoing programs of the Association. The ARL Statistics Committee is working closely with the CLR consultant on the economics of research libraries to explore the feasibility of adding data elements that will enhance the management information gleanable from the statistics. Council has made partial funding available for ARL to add a part-time statistical analyst to its staff until the end of 1985 for this purpose.

4. Make performance measures already tested widely available. Consider gathering and consolidating ARL libraries performance data. Comment: see earlier section of this report. The Statistics Committee continues to look at the role of performance data in the ARL statistics program.

5. Consider development of additional performance measures; add measures throughout the planning period. Comment: the ARL Statistics Committee will be reviewing this task at its meeting in October.

6. Develop methodology for assessment of costs associated with automation and its impact on staffing. Gather and disseminate case study data. Comment: the Statistics Committee is advising the CLR Economic Seminar on the development of the methodology for the assessment of costs associated with automation. In addition, the Committee is further analyzing currently available statistics on the impact of automation on staffing.

7. Augment OMS management survey information with evaluation and recommendation. Comment: OMS staff and the Management Committee have this issue under consideration.

Conclusion

As this report demonstrates, ARL continues to maintain a high level of activity in most of the priority areas. It is my expectation that the level of activity will rise even further during 1985. The members of the Association are to be congratulated for their several and joint commitments to the mission and objectives of ARL. It is quite clear that ARL is an active important factor, if not a key factor, in the future of research libraries in North America.

APPENDIX B

[Reprinted from Retrospective conversion; report of a meeting sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, July 16-18, 1984. Washington, D.C., Bibliographic Services Development Program, Council on Library Resources, 1984.]

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

C. Lee Jones

From July 16 through 18, at the Spring Hill Conference Center in Wayzata, Minnesota, 29 individuals focused their attention on a report, Issues in Retrospective Conversion, prepared by Jutta Reed-Scott, Dorothy Gregor, and Charles Payne. The underlying question during the conference was whether or not the cause of scholarship could be advanced by a carefully articulated program aimed at a coordinated approach to retrospective conversion of manual bibliographic records to machine-readable form by the research libraries of the country.

Support of scholarship and research is the fundamental objective of any retrospective conversion program. A requirement for providing that support is an openly accessible, consistent, logical national database of bibliographic records reflecting the nation's library resources. Throughout the conference it was clear that there are no national boundaries to scholarship and that in the shorter term, the recommendations of the conference and subsequent actions taken should include all North American interests, with a longer-term goal of links to any bibliographic database in the world.

The conference discussions ranged broadly and the debate assured that a wide set of approaches and concerns were aired and became in some way a part of the recommendations that follow. While there may be alternative approaches to the problem, the following represents the sense of the group gathered at Spring Hill. Given the quality and extent of information available (in some cases more than adequate and in others frustratingly sketchy) these recommendations are the strongest statements that can be issued at this time. They suggest action on the part of the Association of Research Libraries as an organization and, less directly, on the part of every research library in the country.

RECOMMENDATION #1

A coordinated retrospective conversion (RECON) program is a viable alternative at this time.

Whatever program results from these recommendations should not be viewed as a replacement for existing local RECON efforts. The fundamental objective of such a program must be the conversion of manual records to machine-readable form and, secondarily, the upgrading of extant machine records that are less than full records.

This first recommendation flowed from the discussion of whether or not it made sense to mount such an organized effort at this time. Some argued that there was so much RECON going on that it would all be done in the next few years, despite the fact that there is no plan in place now and apparently much duplication of effort. The specific degree of duplication was not known, but suspected to be high. Since there are few if any RECON programs searching all shared cataloging service databases and none sharing records with all of them (OCLC, RLIN, WLN, and LC), the argument was made that duplication was bound to be high.

A major question was what was meant by RECON. In the context of this conference, RECON was limited to the original generation of machine records from "older" manual records. Thus, the nearly clerical tasks of identifying records in a database and attaching a holding symbol were deliberately excluded from any plan that might result. However, the process of identifying and upgrading to "full" record status any minimal record was considered to be an important contribution to the quality of resulting databases and so an important part of a national RECON plan.

RECOMMENDATION #2

North American research libraries are the focus of these recommendations and any program that may flow from them. However, this focus must also include the special resources of other institutions.

A principal reason for this focus is the present state of RECON in North America. Many smaller academic and public libraries have finished, embarked upon, or have near-term plans for the complete RECON of their collections. It was indicated that most collections of less than 250,000 volumes can be converted at reasonable institutional costs using the very large databases of one of the utilities or the services of a commercial vendor. A very high percentage of the RECON work will consist of matching records from the database and so require very little "original" RECON work. However, as collection size grows the costs of RECON become so large that it is difficult to devote sufficient institutional resources to accomplish a total RECON.

While there are few large research libraries that do not have some RECON activity either in process or scheduled, it is rare to find one intending to do all extant records because of the number of items requiring "original" RECON work and the very much higher costs associated with this process. In order to assist research libraries with their RECON loads, a coordinated program has a very good chance of distributing the amount of "original" RECON work that any one institution would have to do.

There is no doubt that many smaller non-research libraries must do original RECON for some part of their collections. It is also probably true that there is not much local pressure on them to convert their special collections unless there is an institutional commitment to convert "all" records. For the most part, these libraries will have comparatively few "unique" records to add to a national database. Consequently, in order to expand the national database of RECON records for the benefit of scholars everywhere, it makes sense to focus the national coordinated RECON program on the research library community.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The Association of Research Libraries, probably through its Bibliographic Control Committee, should assume program definition and management oversight responsibilities.

There are several models for operation of such a program within ARL, including the microform clearinghouse and certain OMS operations. ARL should also invite the participation of a representative of IRLA (Independent Research Library Association) during the program definition stages of the process. Early attention needs to be paid to the exact scope of the RECON problem.

Since most of the RECON problem that remains to be solved, at least in terms of "original" RECON, is located within research libraries, it is reasonable to suggest that ARL should take the organizational lead in defining what should be done and the strategy to be used. These recommendations will be forwarded to ARL as soon as possible for their action.

Not all research libraries are members of ARL; several are members of IRLA. To make certain that non-ARL member research libraries are part of the program and are urged to contribute to the end result, they should be invited to participate in the program-definition deliberations of the Bibliographic Control Committee. There will be other collections that should be a part of the program that are not represented by these two organizations, and their interests should also be accounted for in the definition of the program.

The precise scope of the "original" RECON problem is unknown. A modest and rapidly mounted effort should be made to determine the size of the problem and some indication of how it should be approached. Are there concentrations of records that need to be converted? Is the problem tractable?

RECOMMENDATION #4

A coordinated program for RECON must capitalize fully upon other RECON record-producing activities.

There are several projects that are already under way that are creating what amount to RECON records as by-products of their activities. These include the NEH-funded newspaper project, the Major Microform Project, the RLG RECON project, and certain preservation projects. Each of these projects produces bibliographic records that either replace existing manual records or upgrade incomplete machine-form records. It is possible to identify the groups of materials that are being dealt with in these projects and any RECON program must do so in order to avoid or minimize duplicate record production. By recognizing the contributions expected from these ongoing activities, the ARL plan for coordinated RECON work will include these projects and so expand the productivity that can be expected from it.

RECOMMENDATION #5

The approach recommended is to segregate the work by subject based upon the LC classification scheme or, under certain conditions, based upon certain very strong special collections.

Two programs were identified as being useful in identifying institutional strengths based upon subjects as defined by the LC classification scheme: the National Collection Inventory Project (NCIP) and the National Shelflist Count (NSC). Since the former is still in its early stages of operation, it is more likely that the NSC will prove to be more useful in the short run despite certain limitations. While LC information is part of the NSC data, only 25 other libraries are included in this 1977 compilation. NSC can yield initial information on size of research collection, while NCIP will eventually yield collection quality data.

RECOMMENDATION #6

It is important that any institution choosing to participate in the coordinated RECON program agree to produce and share records according to agreed-upon standards.

Those standards are based upon the premise that the fullest possible record properly encoded is to be preferred. Specific standards that should be followed include:

1. MARC format for data encoding and exchange

2. The National Level Bibliographic Record--Minimal Level Record standard is the least acceptable record

3. AACR2 is preferred for access points

4. Subject headings should be LCSH/MESH compatible

There is no point in putting together a program for coordinated RECON unless the resulting records can be shared. Sharing records requires an agreed-upon set of standards and distribution among the databases of the large shared cataloging services and other suppliers of bibliographic records. In the end, these databases are the component parts of our objective, a logical, consistent national bibliographic database openly available to all citizens.

The use of MARC for the exchange of data is assumed.

The specification of the Minimal Level Record as the least acceptable standard is intended to specify the absolute minimum and not to specify the target against which to measure quality. It was recognized that the NLBR--Minimal Level Record was developed for cataloging a book in hand and not for transcribing cataloging data in RECON projects. The intent of including the NLBR among the recommended standards is simply to indicate the minimum acceptable record fullness. In fact, if support is provided in the context of the program for the production of RECON "original" records, little or no support should be provided for the production of minimal records. Any minimal record that is selected by another institution may force that institution to do additional work if it chooses to use only full records in its database. The object of the program is to do as many "original" RECON records as possible and do them fully once so that others may share them without undue additional work.

There is also a need to keep the costs of RECON under control. Specifying AACR2 as preferred for access points is a case in point. Should all access points and descriptions be required to be consistent with AACR2, few if any institutions could afford the time required to bring old records up to the new standard. This would amount to recataloging and not just converting from a manual to a machine record. The possibilities of doing post-cataloging authority work should be explored. It may be possible to convert headings to AACR2 form by running bibliographic records against an AACR2 authority file and upgrading those headings that are in conflict with other headings in the database.

Where subject headings are used in a RECON record they should be consistent with the two largest controlled subject heading lists, the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and the National Library of Medicine's *Medical Subject Headings*. It was agreed that subjects will be important even for the older records, and that an effort to assure consistency with the two prime subject heading standards was required for the benefit of users.

RECOMMENDATION #7

The telecommunication protocols resulting from the Linked Systems Project should provide the enabling mechanism for the sharing of records produced on the several shared cataloging services' systems.

The linking protocols that are now in the testing phase and approaching the implementation stages are viewed as the appropriate mechanisms for making resulting and other records available to the library user community. It is realized that this is an option that will take some time to implement, but it should remain the objective of the library community.

RECOMMENDATION #8

When the Linked Systems Project is fully operational, access to records will be dramatically enhanced. However, access to all original or upgraded records resulting from a coordinated RECON program should be provided through an LC distribution mechanism. There are at least two possibilities for LC distribution. LC might simply take records contributed to the RECON projects on the various utilities and distribute the records without incorporating them into an LC database. Or, and participants saw this as the more desirable possibility, LC records input by another organization according to guidelines specified by LC might be accepted into the LC MARC file, maintained by LC as part of the MARC file, and distributed as part of the MARC Distribution Service. The Library of Congress agreed to investigate the possibilities for an LC distribution mechanism.

Participants recognized that the widest possible distribution would come from using an LC distribution mechanism. All subscribers would receive the records and there are no limits, other than financial, to those who may subscribe. The commercial sector will thus be served as readily as the not-for-profit sector.

RECOMMENDATION #9

The ARL Bibliographic Control Committee should explore a variety of funding options for the support of a coordinated RECON program.

Individual projects should be packaged for fund raising purposes. In addition, a strategy of assessments of research libraries should be explored. Finally, appropriate staff from Title II-C and NEH should be advised that a coordinated RECON program is being prepared.

RECON activities have received sporadic support for several years. Much of what has been done has been done with local funding in efforts to implement online circulation systems that required more or less full bibliographic records as raw material, and there is bound to be more local support of RECON in the years to come. A national coordinated strategy for retrospective conversion, whether fully/partially funded or not, would provide the context in which institutions could approach their own RECON projects, knowing that they would be making a contribution to the national RECON effort.

Thus, a worst case of no extramural support for RECON still calls for a logical, coordinated RECON plan.

There are, however, many foundations that may be interested in specific pieces of the RECON problem. It would be useful, for example, to put together a package that might be interesting to the Getty Foundation in the area of art and architecture. Other foundations may be interested in other pieces of the knowledge spectrum. It would not be terribly difficult, once data was examined from the NSIP, to put together some subject assignment suggestions for a limited number of institutions, to secure their commitment to the concept, and to seek support for a cooperative project in a specific subject area. The nature of the support should be such that each participating institution is investing in the project rather substantially. Foundations are more likely to be interested in providing matching funds than they are in supporting all the institution's costs relative to RECON. Support should be sought within these limitations.

In a more broadly based program for generating support for RECON, ARL should consider a program of assessments of research libraries in order to accumulate resources that could be used as matching funds for the RECON effort. Some institutions will be able to make cash payments to a project-specific fund. Others will not be able to do much more than to allocate a specific sum within their operating budgets as matching support for RECON. These non-cash commitments are likely to be in the form of staff and other resources and should be viewed as an acceptable alternative to cash commitments. Again, such a resource pool may attract matching attention from the foundation and federal funding communities.

Both Title II-C and NEH have funded RECON projects in a less than coordinated way over the past several years. Both agencies should be alerted to the fact that there is now an effort to produce a logical, coordinated plan for RECON activities. The Title II-C deadline of November 1 is very close, but some may be able to take advantage of it if a draft plan were to be available by October 1 or so. In any case, alerting these two programs to what is coming should allow them to capitalize upon the plan in their support of RECON proposals.

The foregoing constitute the central recommendations of the three-day conference. As one might expect, there were many other recommendations that did not receive such wide support or that had poor specific fits in the program recommended above. The most useful of these recommendations are summarized as miscellaneous recommendations.

MISCELLANEOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

Optical Character Recognition (OCR) techniques should be explored in light of some new developments in the field. Given that most of RECON is the capture of data that already exists in a variety of print formats and that there have been some interesting recent developments in OCR and the controlling software, a renewed examination of OCR technology for purposes of supporting RECON should be undertaken. The Council on Library Resources (CLR) committed itself to such an appraisal.

One of the products of the RECON program will be the conversion of records that were originally the product of LC cataloging. It was suggested that all of these records should be flagged and sent to LC by the shared cataloging services as a service to LC. LC representatives agreed to consider the usefulness to LC of this suggestion.

While the Linked Systems Project will result in operating links between the Library of Congress, the Research Libraries Group, and the Washington Library Network, it will be some time before OCLC can become a part of the technical link. Microenhancer or similar techniques using microcomputers should be developed for searching several databases in the RECON process. Since one of the objectives is to reduce duplicative effort, it makes no sense to search only one database when there is some likelihood that similar work may already have been done on one or more others. This suggestion may require more software work on the part of the target databases than they are willing to do, but there was encouragement to explore this avenue as a short-term solution to the lack of operational links among the utilities.

These recommendations form the essence of a nationally coordinated program for retrospective conversion of print form bibliographic records. It is a program that has the chance of reducing the aggregate costs of the RECON process and securing funding for making a very large dent in the inventory of records that need to be converted to machine-readable form in order to better support the work of the scholarly community.

APPENDIX C

GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM PRESERVATION EFFORTS IN ARL LIBRARIES

[Approved by the ARL Membership on October 25, 1984*]

Since physical deterioration of research library collections is a well known matter of particular concern, the ARL has adopted as its third principal objective in its 1983 five year plan: "To increase the number of member libraries engaged in programs to preserve their collections." That document acknowledges that individual research libraries bear responsibility for preserving their collections as part of the collective resources of the research libraries of North America. ARL efforts to achieve this objective will be aimed at helping libraries meet this local responsibility. ARL should provide leadership and, to assist in this important task, guidelines are needed to suggest an appropriate minimum preservation effort that each research library should seek to attain.

"Preservation" is here meant to be broadly inclusive of efforts to maintain collections that are intended for use by future generations. This obligation of our present generation needs to be expressed in a set of activities that provides appropriate protection and some assurance of the continued availability of those materials that are now in, or are being added to, research library collections.

"Minimum" is here used to mean a desirable and presumably practical level of moderate strength to which all ARL libraries should aspire in the course of this decade. Once attained, it is a level which should be able to be maintained over the long term. It is well below an optimum level, and indeed it is far below what the more ambitious libraries with good financial support can attain. It is hoped that this minimum level is one which by 1988 at least half of the ARL membership could attain or exceed; and by the end of this decade all ARL libraries could have attained or exceeded.

The elements of a minimum effort are diverse. There are few activities in a research library that do not in one fashion or another affect the longevity of materials. A comprehensive preservation effort certainly includes attention to the atmospheric environment in which the materials are housed and used. It could include the training methods used for staff handling of materials, the photocopy operations, the acid content of bookplates, the quality of bookstack shelving, the ultraviolet filtration of fluorescent tubes, and even the very nature of the materials that are selected for addition to the collections. (See Attachment 1 for an attempted statement of responsibility by one organization.)

---

* The ARL membership voted to approved the Guidelines with the understanding that further clarification would be forthcoming on the gathering and reporting of preservation statistics. The Committee on ARL Statistics and the Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials will address this issue in 1985.

Recognizing that there is an almost infinite set of conditions that could be included in a guideline for minimum preservation effort, the ARL has chosen five aspects that seem possible of attainment by its membership. Taken together they should constitute a good base of minimum effort.

1) Local program statement: Every library should have a document defining its preservation goals and objectives together with a statement of current and prospective preservation activities. Such a document should at the least include a description of the various preservation program elements that currently exist in the library and should outline those that it will seek to provide within a short period of years. The document would not detail the specifics of the program. Rather it constitutes a general program statement that would convey to its staff, organizational officers and trustees, and to other ARL members a clear sense of the content of the program, the direction that is intended by the library administration, and the strength and emphasis with which it is to be pursued.

2) Statistics: There should regularly be compiled a set of statistics that will document the annual preservation activity and present over a period of time a picture of the change in the activity. Such data at the least should include:

- FTE staff assigned to the preservation activity;
- preservation expenditures;
- proportion of preservation expenditures coming from regular library budget;
- number of volumes given full conservation treatment, given routine conservation treatment, and given protective enclosures;
- number of volumes bound or rebound;
- number of volumes given mass deacidification;
- number of reels of preservation microfilms and sheets of preservation microfiche produced;
- number of reels of preservation microfilms and sheets of preservation microfiche held.

(Comment: Only some preservation activities are amenable to statistics collection. Exactly which statistics can and should be collected is not yet known. The statistics listed above appear on a preservation questionnaire which will be distributed in 1985 on an experimental basis. Based on the outcome of this test, ARL will revise future versions of these guidelines.)

3) National participation: All current efforts to film or otherwise copy for preservation purposes should be part of a coordinated national effort and consequently there should be three correlative activities. First, before making a decision to film, a careful search must be made for an existing archival master negative that can be copied. Second, there should be adherence to archival standards in the production, storage and use of master microfilm negatives whenever they are made. And third, the

records for those master microfilm negatives should be contributed to the National Union Catalog or the comparable listing of newspapers, and/or should be contributed to at least one major bibliographic utility in order to ensure online availability of bibliographic records for preservation copies of films.

4) Environmental conditions: Materials in all collections that are unique in the library, and those for which a primary collection responsibility as part of a national collection coordinated effort has been assumed, should be housed in an environment that is filtered and air conditioned such as to temper the natural extremes of temperature and humidity. While this minimum does not specify the mechanical requirements of the air conditioning system, it is presumed that the minimum is at least a system which has cooling, humidity control and particulate filtration. Optimum conditions and archival standard conditions would of course be much more rigorous, requiring closed stacks, limited access to certain materials, and other protective measures, but these are not mandated at the minimum level.

5) Current budgetary effort: The library should allocate to measurable preservation activities an amount equal to at least ten percent of its materials budget or four percent of its overall budget. Measurable preservation activities are defined as staff, materials, and contract expenditures for binding, full conservation treatment, routine conservation treatment, protective enclosures, preservation microfilming, and mass deacidification. See Attachment 2 for definintions of these items. Whereas academic and research libraries currently spend for preservation, as defined in Attachment 2, from 1% to as much as 21% of their current operating budgets, only those programs in the range above 4% of expenditures can be said to be moderately strong and emerging into maturity. While this 4% figure is a subjective judgement, it is like any service standard that is meant to provide a rough characterization of what may be relatively strong and vigorous, yet in need of improvement and possibly less than the institution can achieve with some additional effort. This has to be an approximation in many libraries due to the fact that local accounting may not facilitate aggregation of expenses for preservation as defined.

The exact allocation of the preservation budgetary resources to various activities is a matter that can only be resolved locally. Thus, no attempt is made to suggest the apportionment except to call attention to the illustrative activities in the above definition of preservation.

(Comment: This four percent is a guess as to what magnitude of program may achieve equilibrium, as much progress made in preservation as will offset the rate of deterioration over the long haul. Indeed, further experience in the extent of preservation effort needed in order to begin to break even on the rate of deterioration may well suggest that 10% or even more may be necessary as a minimum. Research libraries with an exceptionally high proportion of manuscripts on poor paper or printed materials from the period with the worst paper may in fact have to expend what to others may seem an exhorbitant proportion of their operating funds on preservation if they intend to achieve equilibrium. There could therefore be an optimum level of support, which may at individual libraries be several times the minimum level suggested above. And it should be no surprise, and certainly imply no managerial criticism, if a majority of ARL libraries today fail to exceed the minimum. Especially when dollars are scarce, priorities must be set for what can and cannot be achieved. It is probably the case that every library feels that it is inadequately coping with preservation deficiencies.)

This guideline for a minimum preservation effort was prepared in the light of informed opinion in 1983. The state of technical and scientific knowledge about the nature and rate of deterioration of library materials, and of methods for their stablization or strengthening, is still primitive enough that the current generation cannot with certainty say what should be a minimum preservation effort or an optimum preservation effort over the long term. As a consequence, this guideline will be reviewed by ARL every three years. Additions and modifications are to be expected as experience casts additional light on the topic. It is intended that this guideline serve as an encouragement, as a benchmark for individual effort, and not that it be used for accreditation purposes. The field of preservation is too uncertain to warrant such a rigid approach.

On the other hand, the extent of deteriorated collections is now of such overwhelming magnitude that the current generation must set some goals and strive mightily to achieve these if in fact we are to guard against leaving for our successors a literally impossible task. On that basis, the ARL believes that this guideline for minimum preservation effort is a step in the right direction, and it is commended to ARL members for individual application. The aggregate result of our efforts should serve to strengthen the research capacities of our libraries for the years ahead. This is our obligation to future generations of scholars.

ARL Committee on Preservation
of Research Library Materials

Harold W. Billings
Margaret S. Child, Council on
Library Resources Liaison
John Laucus
Peter Sparks, Library of Congress
Liaison
David H. Stam
David C. Weber
Margaret Otto, Chair

June 21, 1984

Attachment 1

Minimum Preservation Obligations for RLG Members in Areas of Primary Collecting Responsibility

Member libraries should recognize special obligations to maintain and preserve their collections in areas of primary collecting responsibility (as defined by the Collection Management and Development Committee) and to enhance preservation of these materials as resources permit. These in-depth subject collections not only serve the holding library and its patrons but are also a resource for the whole of the Research Libraries Group and the larger population of scholars and researchers nationwide. Such collections should be maintained in good condition in hard copy or microform to allow the researcher continued access.

Material is considered to be in good condition if it can be subjected to normal use, now and into the foreseeable future, without incurring noticeable damage. Publications on paper are not in good condition if the paper is so brittle that it will crack or break when handled or photocopies, if it cannot be bound or rebound, or if it is highly acidic (for example, groundwood paper such as newsprint) and therefore likely to become brittle within a few years. Bound volumes are not in good condition if the internal binding structure is broken, or if covers are not intact. Publications on a film base (microforms, slides, etc.) are not in good condition if the film is torn, stained, scratched, or otherwise degraded to the point that it cannot be read on proper viewing equipment, or if the film housing (reel, slide mount) is damaged. Mutilated volumes are by definition not in good condition, and priority should be given to replacing missing or mutilated portions of library materials.

If volumes are not in good condition, they may be repaired, rebound, or restored where possible, if this is adequate to maintain the title in good condition. If not, the library may acquire a reprint or microform replacement if available. If this is not possible, the item may be filmed or reproduced in an archival hard-copy format.

Approved by the RLG Preservation Committee, October 15, 1981.
Approved by the RLG Collection Management and Development Committee,
January 21, 1983.

Attachment 2

Sources of Information on Preservation from ARL's Office of Management Studies

Planning for Preservation: OMS SPEC Kit #66. 1980.
Includes initial planning reports and recommendations, program and policy statements, and historical perspectives on preservation development.

Preparing for Emergencies and Disasters: OMS SPEC Kit #69. 1980.
Includes excerpts from committee reports, manuals, plans, and case histories covering disaster preparedness, protecting people and property, and salvaging library materials.

Basic Preservation Procedures: OMS SPEC Kit #70. 1981.
Includes policy statements, guidelines, and procedural instructions on the physical care and protection of library materials, as well as reproduction and decision-making.

Preservation Planning Program Resource Notebook, compiled by Pamela W. Darling. OMS 1982.
A compilation of articles and documents on preservation organization and administration, the physical environment in relation to preservation, protection of materials, surveying collection conditions, disaster preparedness, microfilming the physical nature and treatment of various kinds of materials, and education and training for preservation.

APPENDIX D

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

October 5, 1984

To: ARL Board of Directors

From: Office of Management Studies (OMS)

Re: Status of OMS Programs
May - September 1984

I. SEPARATELY FUNDED AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

A. General Electric Foundation/Public Services Study: All seven studies are progressing on schedule. Final reports are available from Michigan State, University of California, Riverside and Newberry Library. Final reports are expected shortly from the other test sites. A follow up evaluation questionnaire is being sent to each library to assess the value and impact of the study.

As a result of the pilot library studies, we are revising the Public Services Study Manual and designing additional analytical modules. The study is now available to ARL members as part of the ongoing OMS Academic Library Program. ARL members were surveyed in the summer to determine interest in participating in the program on a cost recovery basis. Twenty libraries expressed interest and we are scheduling exploratory visits to those institutions requesting them.

The seven separately-funded research projects produced preliminary reports published in September encompassing the following topics:

1. Online Catalogs

   - New York University Libraries: A Study of an Online Caalog from a Public Services Perspective

   - Pennsylvania State University Libraries: The Effect of an Instruction Program on Online Catalog Users

2. Science Information Needs

   - University of Arizona: Assessing the Instructional Needs of Students in a Selected Scientific Discipline

   - Cornell University Libraries: Information Resources in Agricultural Research

3. User Studies

- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: The Invisible User: User Needs in an Electronic Environment
- Michigan State University Libraries: Non-Users of the MSU Libraries: An Assessment of Characteristics, Perceptions, and Needs
- Texas A&M University: A Comparison of Two End User Operated Search Systems

B. *Program to Support National and Regional Cooperative Collection Development*: Phase II of the National Collections Inventory Project has tested project resources in the state of Indiana. Training was provided for bibliographers and selectors at the three Indiana ARL libraries (Indiana University, University of Notre Dame and Purdue University) and they have completed major sections of the Conspectus. Plans are in place for completion of the Conspectus at the libraries and specialized research collections in Indiana's non-research libraries have been identified for inclusion in the National Inventory. The experience of the Indiana libraries will lead to final revision of the Project Manual and training resources. ARL is now represented on the RLG Task Force on the Conspectus; suggested additions and revisions to the Conspectus are being successfully dealt with by that group. Working arrangements between ARL and RLG for the management and operation of the Inventory have been negotiated and are working well. Libraries in the University of California system began working on the Conspectus in June and a group of 13 ARL libraries in the Southeast are planning to begin work in late fall or early winter. The Canadian Association of Research Libraries will be considering Inventory participation at their November meeting. A proposal for Phase III has been drafted and is being considered by the Board at this meeting. The major intent of this proposal is to expand participation in the National Collections Inventory to virtually all ARL members over the next several years.

C. *Institute on Research Libraries for Library Science Faculty*: The Council on Library Resources provided the funding to conduct the Institute on Research Libraries for 12 invited library science faculty. The faculty members represented 11 library schools in the U.S. and Canada and met in Chapel Hill, North Carolina on July 9 - July 27 to learn about current issues, trends, and practices in research libraries. Hosts for the event were the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill's Academic Affairs Library, James Govan, director; and the UNC-CH School of Library Science, Edward G. Holley, dean.

The Institute included seminars conducted by prominent librarians, educators, and academic administrators, and field visits to libraries at three institutions: Duke University, North Carolina State University, and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

Academic administrators who served as seminar leaders included Dr. David D. Dill, assistant to the chancellor for planning, UNC-CH; Dr. Raymond H. Dawson, vice president for academic affairs, UNC system; Dean Holley; Dr. J. Charles Morrow, UNC-CH provost; and Dr. William S. Shipp, associate provost for computing, Brown University.

Among the librarians who led seminars were Hugh C. Atkinson, university librarian, University of Illinois; Margaret Beckman, executive director for information technology, University of Guelph; Richard M. Dougherty, director of libraries, University of Michigan; Sheila Dowd, associate university librarian for collections, University of California-Berkeley; Ellen Hahn, chief, General Reading Room and Research Services Division, Library of Congress, and Patricia Swanson, associate university librarian for science, University of Chicago.

On the basis of the success of this first Institute a proposal will be made to the Council on Library Resources to support additional Institutes.

D. Preservation Planning Studies: The National Endowment for the Humanities awarded the Association a two-year grant of $65,375 to support the conduct of Preservation Planning Program studies at ten ARL members. The funding will allow participating libraries to systematically examine present preservation practices and develop a strategic plan for improving their preservation capabilities over the next decade. The selection of participants is being accomplished by the ARL Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials using criteria developed by project staff. Fourteen libraries have applied for the program and decisions on participants will be made by the middle of October. The first studies will begin before the end of 1984.

II. CORE OMS PROGRAMS SUPPORTED BY COST RECOVERY AND THE ARL DUES ALLOTMENT

A. Development of new projects or services:

- A grant proposal to design a technical services review was developed by OMS and reviewed by the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control. The proposal was examined in relation to efforts to establish a national retrospective conversion project.

- A profile of automation activities of member libraries was designed with the assistance of the ARL Committee on Statistics and, an Automation Inventory of members was conducted in the summer. Results are being analyzed and the initial profile is scheduled to be published by the end of 1984.

- An Analytical Skills Institute was developed for review by the ARL Committee on Management. This Institute would concentrate on providing statistical, problem-solving and analytical skills for academic librarians. Pending committee approval, this new Institute series will be started in 1985.

B. Academic Library Program: Collection Analysis Projects have been concluded at Colorado and Duke and are underway at Alberta, Houston, Georgetown Law, and Wyoming. Organizational studies are in progress at Case-Western Reserve and Syracuse. A review of performance appraisal at the McGill Libraries was completed.

Exploratory visits for the public services studies were conducted at Howard University, University of California-Santa Barbara, Boston University and Colorado State University.

C. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center: Since the last board meeting the center has issued SPEC Flyer/Kits on the following topics: Microcomputers #104 (May 1984); Nonbibliographic Machine-Readable Databases #105 (June 1984); Electronic Mail #106 (July-August 1984).

D. The Training and Staff Development Program: Two Advanced Management Skills Institutes were conducted in Australia (Canberra and Brisbane) with 54 participants in August.

A special focus workshop on introducing and managing change was conducted at the University of Cincinnati in September for 33 participants.

A special focus workshop on performance appraisal was conducted at the Washington University in St. Louis for 29 participants.

Susan Jurow joined the Association in September as OMS training program specialist. Her previous position was as Assistant to the Director of the University of California Northern Regional Library Facility. She also served as Acting Head of Reference at the University of Houston and Head of Current Periodicals and Microtexts at Stanford University.

A report on the Management Institute for Directors held in February was issued, and an inquiry sent to ARL directors concerning interest in participating in future Institutes. The number of positive responses to this inquiry has lead to scheduling of an Institute on February 20-23, 1985 in Washington D.C.

The 1985 schedule of public Management Skills Institutes was prepared. They include:

BASIC

April 14-17, 1985	Philadelphia, PA
October 27-30, 1985	Denver, CO

ADVANCED

March 17-22, 1985	Berkeley, CA
November 17-22, 1985	Boston, MA

In addition, several ARL members are negotiating with the OMS to conduct sponsored Institutes at their libraries.

E. OMS Operations:* The OMS Budget Projections for 1985 for the core programs include:

Staff Expenses:	$219,800
Administrative Expenses:	118,500
Total	$338,300

The Office expects income from the following sources:

Library studies:	$ 50,000
Publications:	70,000
Training	70,000
Interest on invested funds	5,000
Reimbursement for travel costs	25,000
Proposed ARL Dues Allotment	$115,500
Total	$335,000

III. OMS STAFF WORK WITH ARL COMMITTEES

A. ARL Committee on Management of Research Libraries: The committee met in May to discuss progress of OMS programs. A meeting is planned in October to consider proposed new service proposals and training activities. The committee will also review proposed revisions in OMS prices.

B. ARL Committee on Library Education: An expanded group based on this committee advised the OMS in the design, conduct and evaluation of the Institute on Research Libraries for Library School Faculty. Five committee members participated directly in the third week of the Institute.

C. ARL Task Force on Research Library Staffing: OMS staff assisted in the design of four organizational projections to be used by the Task Force in considering staffing issues for the next decade. OMS staff met with the task force in May and June to consider key elements in these projections.

D. ARL Collection Management Committee: OMS staff have worked with the committee in monitoring progress of the National Collections Inventory Project and in planning future phases of the Project. Staff met with this committee in May and developed a proposal for NCIP Phase III, based on the committee's advice.

E. ARL Statistics Committee: Staff have worked with this committee in designing the Automation Inventory, so that results will provide a basis for further data-gathering efforts. A proposal to analyze statistics from annual reports will be discussed at the October committee meeting.

F. ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control: OMS staff met twice with tis committee to review proposals for development of a technical services study.

D.E. Webster

APPENDIX E

ATTENDANCE AT 105th MEMBERSHIP MEETING
WASHINGTON, D.C.

OCTOBER 24-25, 1984

University of Alabama Libraries
Douglas E. Jones

University of Alberta Library
Peter Freeman

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Constance Corey

Boston Public Library
Liam M. Kelly

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Sterling J. Albrecht

University of British Columbia Library
Douglas McInnes

Brown University Library
Frederick Lynden

University of California, Berkeley Library
Joseph Rosenthal

University of California, Davis Library
Not Represented

University of California, Irvine Library
Calvin J. Boyer

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Russell Shank

University of California, Riverside Library
Joan Chambers

University of California, San Diego Library
Millicent D. Abell

University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Joseph A. Boissé

Canada Inst. for Scientific & Technical Info.
Inez M. Heseltine

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Susan Coté

Center for Research Libraries
Donald B. Simpson

University of Chicago Library
Martin D. Runkle

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Charles B. Osburn

University of Colorado Library
Clyde Walton

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Paula Kaufman

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Louis E. Martin

Dartmouth College Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

University of Delaware Library
Susan Brynteson

Duke University Libraries
Not Represented

Emory University Library
Herbert F. Johnson

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
David F. Bishop

Georgia Institute of Technology Library
Miriam Drake

University of Guelph Library
John Black

Harvard University Library
Sidney Verba

University of Hawaii Library
John R. Haak

University of Houston Libraries
Robin Downes

Howard University Libraries
Kenneth Wilson

University of Illinois Library
Hugh C. Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
Elaine F. Sloan

University of Iowa Libraries
Dale M. Bentz

Iowa State University Library
Warren B. Kuhn

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
Clinton Howard

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul A. Willis

Kent State University Libraries
Don Tolliver

Library of Congress
William J. Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Larry X. Besant

Louisiana State University Library
Sharon Hogan

McGill University Library
Not Represented

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Manitoba Libraries
Earl Ferguson

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Librs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Frank Rodgers

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

University of Missouri Library
Thomas W. Shaughnessy

National Agricultural Library
Joseph H. Howard

National Library of Canada
Marianne Scott

National Library of Medicine
Lois A. Colaianni

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
James A. Rawley

Newberry Library
Not Represented

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
David H. Stam

New York State Library
Peter Paulson

New York University Libraries
Carlton Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

North Carolina State University Library
I.T. Littleton

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert C. Miller

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Sul H. Lee

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Not Represented

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Anne Woodsworth

Princeton University Library
Donald Koepp

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
James Thompson

University of Rochester Libraries
James F. Wyatt

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

University of Saskatchewan Library
Nancy A. Brown

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern California Library
Albert Brecht

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State Univ. of New York at Albany Libraries
Joseph Z. Nitecki

State Univ. of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Saktidas Roy

State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook Library
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald C. Anthony

Temple University Library
George Libbey

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Not Represented

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Marilyn Sharrow

Tulane University Library
Philip E. Leinbach

University of Utah Libraries
Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
Malcolm Getz

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
Thomas A. Souter

University of Virginia Libraries
Kendon L. Stubbs

University of Washington Library
Merle N. Boylan

Washington State University Library
Donald Bushaw

Washington University Libraries
Virginia Toliver

University of Waterloo Library
Murray C. Shepherd

Wayne State University Libraries
Peter Spyers-Duran

University of Western Ontario Library
Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Not Represented

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford Rogers

York University Libraries
Ellen Hoffmann

0317M

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	University of California, San Diego Library
Albrecht, Sterling J.	Brigham Young University Library
Anderson, Le Moyne W.	Colorado State University Library
Anthony, Donald	Syracuse University Libraries
Atkinson, Hugh C.	University of Illinois Library
Bentz, Dale M.	University of Iowa Libraries
Besant, Larry X.	Linda Hall Library
Bishop, David F.	University of Georgia Libraries
Black, John	University of Guelph Library
Boisse, Joseph A.	University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Boylan, Merle N.	University of Washington Library
Boyer, Calvin J.	University of California, Irvine Library
Brecht, Albert	University of Southern California Library
Brown, Nancy	University of Saskatchewan Library
Brynteson, Susan	University of Delaware Library
Bushaw, Donald	Washington State University Library
Chambers, Joan	University of California, Riverside Library
Chapin, Richard E.	Michigan State University Library
Colaianni Lois A.	National Library of Medicine
Corey, Constance	Arizona State University Library
Coté, Susan	Case Western Reserve University Library
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
De Gennaro, Richard	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of Michigan Library
Downes, Robin	University of Houston Libraries
Drake, Miriam	Georgia Institute of Technology Library
Edelman Hendrik	Rutgers University Library
Ferguson, Earl	University of Manitoba Libraries
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Freeman, Peter	University of Alberta Library
Getz, Malcolm	Vanderbilt University Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Haak, John R.	University of Hawaii Library
Hanson, Roger K.	University of Utah Libraries
Harrar, Joanne H.	University of Maryland Library
Harrer, Gustave A.	University of Florida Libraries
Heseltine, Inez M.	Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information
Hill, Graham R.	McMaster University Library
Hoadley, Irene B.	Texas A&M University Library

Hoffmann, Ellen	York University Libraries
Hogan, Sharon	Louisiana State University Library
Howard, Clinton	University of Kansas Library
Howard, Joseph H.	National Agricultural Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Jeffs, Joseph	Georgetown University Library
Johnson, Herbert F.	Emory University Library
Jones, Douglas E.	University of Alabama Libraries
Kelly, Liam M.	Boston Public Library
Kaufman, Paula	Columbia University Libraries
Koepp, Donald	Princeton University Library
Kuhn, Warren B.	Iowa State University Library
Laird, W. David	University of Arizona Library
Laucas, John	Boston University Library
Lee, Robert	University of Western Ontario Library
Lee, Sul H.	University of Oklahoma Library
Leinbach, Philip E.	Tulane University Library
Libbey, George	Temple University Library
Littleton, I.T.	North Carolina State University Library
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
Lynden, Frederick	Brown University Library
McBurney, Margot B.	Queen's University Library
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
McInnes, Douglas	University of British Columbia Library
Maloy, Robert	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Martin, Louis E.	Cornell University Libraries
Martin, Susan K.	Johns Hopkins University Library
Miller, Charles E.	Florida State University Library
Miller, Robert C.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Nitecki, Joseph Z.	State University of New York at Albany Libraries
Osburn, Charles B.	University of Cincinnati Libraries
Otto, Margaret A.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Paulson, Peter	New York State Library
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Rawley, James A.	University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Rochell, Carlton	New York University Libraries
Rodgers, Frank	University of Miami Library
Rosenthal, Joseph	University of California, Berkeley Library
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Runkle, Martin D.	University of Chicago Library
Rogers, Rutherford D.	Yale University Libraries

Saktidas, Roy	State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Scott, Marianne	National Library of Canada
Sharrow, Marilyn	University of Toronto Libraries
Shank, Russell	University of California, Los Angeles Library
Shaughnessy, Thomas W.	University of Missouri Library
Shepherd, Murray	University of Waterloo Library
Simpson, Donald B.	Center for Research Libraries
Sloan, Elaine F.	Indiana University Libraries
Smith, Eldred	University of Minnesota Libraries
Smith, John B.	State University of New York at Stony Brook Library
Souter, Thomas A.	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
Spyers-Duran, Peter	Wayne State University Libraries
Stam, David H.	New York Public Library
Stubbs, Kendon L.	University of Virginia Library
Studer, William A.	Ohio State University Libraries
Talbot, Richard J.	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Thompson, James	Rice University Library
Tolliver, Don	Kent State University Libraries
Toliver, Virginia	Washington University Libraries
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Libraries
Vassallo, Paul	University of New Mexico Library
Verba, Sidney	Harvard University Library
Walton, Clyde	University of Colorado Library
Weber, David C.	Stanford University Libraries
Welsh, William J.	Library of Congress
Willis, Paul A.	University of Kentucky Libraries
Wilson, Kenneth	Howard University Libraries
Woodsworth, Anne	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Wyatt, James F.	University of Rochester Libraries

Guests

Avram, Henriette	Library of Congress
Branin, Joseph J.	Columbia University/CLR Intern
Brown Rowland C.	OCLC, Inc.
Burckel, Nicholas C.	University of Chicago/CLR Intern
Child, Margaret	Council on Library Resources
Cogswell, James	Johns Hopkins University/CLR Intern
Finzi, John C.	Library of Congress
Fretwell, Gordon	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Fry, Ray	Department of Education
Gregor, Dorothy	Library of Congress
Gwinn, Nancy E.	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Harris, Carolyn	University of Georgia/CLR Intern
Holley, Edward	University of North Carolina, School of Library Science
Jackson, Arlyne	Emory University/CLR Intern
McCoy, Richard W.	Research Libraries Group
Metz, Paul	Northwestern University/CLR Intern
Molyneux, Robert E.	University of Virginia/ARL
Morton, Herbert	American Council of Learned Societies
Sparks, Peter G.	Library of Congress
White, Herbert S.	Indiana University School of Library and Information Science

ARL Staff

Shirley Echelman, Executive Director
Duane E. Webster, Deputy Executive Director and Director, Office of Management Studies
Jaia Barrett, Program Officer
Julia Blixrud, Manager, CONSER A&I Project
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey Heynen, Program Officer
Susan Jurow, Training Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Alex Lichtenstein, Administrative Assistant
Jutta Reed-Scott, Collections Development Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine K. Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies

APPENDIX F

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

OCTOBER 1984

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1983-84

Eldred Smith, President
Richard J. Talbot, Vice President & President-Elect
James F. Govan, Past President

Hugh C. Atkinson	(Oct. 1985)
Patricia Battin	(Oct. 1985)
Graham R. Hill	(Oct. 1986)
Herbert F. Johnson	(Oct. 1986)
W. David Laird	(Oct. 1986)
William. J. Studer	(Oct. 1984)
Paul Vassallo	(Oct. 1985)
Anne Woodsworth	(Oct. 1984)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Center for Chinese Research Materials

Samuel Chu, Ohio State University (1986)
Thomas Kennedy, Washington, State University (1986)
Douglas McInnes (1985)
Antony Marr, Yale University (1984)
Lyman Van Slyke, Stanford University (1984)
Eugene Wu, Harvard University, Chair (1985)

ARL Microform Project Cataloging Program

Duane Bogenschneider, Microfilming Corporation of America, Inc.
Joseph A. Boisse
Robert Grey Cole, University of Mississippi
Linda Hamilton, Research Publications, Inc.
Joseph Howard
Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC, Inc.
Tina Kass, Research Libraries Group
Elaine Sloan
Del Williams, Western Illinois University

ARL Microform Project Preservation Program

Harold W. Billings
Margaret Child, Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Nancy Gwinn
Margaret A. Otto
Andrew Raymond, Northeast Document Conservation Center
Peter Sparks, Library of Congress
David H. Stam
Clyde Walton
David C. Weber

CONSER A & I Coverage Project

Linda Bartley, Library of Congress
Brett Butler, Information Access Corporation
Thomas Delsey, National Library of Canada
Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC, Inc.
Jay K. Lucker
James L. Wood, Chemical Abstract Service

National Collections Inventory Project

David Farrell, Indiana University
Leslie Hume, Research Libraries Group
Paul Mosher, Stanford University
Susan Nutter, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Elaine F. Sloan
David H. Stam

STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chair

Committee on the Management of Research Libraries

Joan Chambers (1985)
Richard De Gennaro (1985)
Herbert Johnson, (ex officio as Chair of Committee on ARL Statistics)
Sul H. Lee (1986)
Susan K. Martin (1986)
Clyde Walton (1984)
Jay K. Lucker, Chair (1984)

Committee on ARL Statistics

Calvin J. Boyer (1985)
Gordon Fretwell, University of Massachusetts (1985)
Robert Lee (1985)
Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia (1985)
Herbert F. Johnson, Chair (1984)

Public Services Project Advisory Committee

Harold W. Billings
Robin Downes
Jay K. Lucker
Susan K. Martin
Robert C. Miller
Merrily Taylor
Paul Vassallo

Committee on Library Education

Irene B. Hoadley (1984)
Edward Holley, University of North Carolina (1985)
Herbert White, Indiana University (1984)
Merrily Taylor (1985)
Margot B. McBurney, Chair (1984)

Membership Committee on Nonuniversity Libraries

Donald C. Anthony (1985)
Larry Besant (1986)
Robert Maloy (1985)
Donald Riggs (1986)

Marilyn Sharrow, Chair (1985)

Coordinating Committee on Collections and Access

Dale Bentz	(1985)
Susan Brynteson	(1985)
Robert Miller	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Collection Development)
Margaret Otto	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials)
Joseph Rosenthal	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Bibliographic Control)
Elaine Sloan, Chair	(1986)

Committee on Bibliographic Control

Henriette Avram, Library of Congress Liaison
David Bishop (1985)
D. Kaye Gapen (1985)
Joseph H. Howard (1984)
C. Lee Jones, Council on Library Resources Liaison
Martin D. Runkle (1985)
Marianne Scott (1985)
Joseph Rosenthal, Chair (1984)

Committee on Collection Development

Marianne Scott (1985)
Charles Miller (1986)
Joseph Boissé (1986)
Robin Downes (1985)
Joseph Dagnese (1985)
Robert Miller, Chair (1986)
John Finzi, L.C. Liaison

Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials

Harold W. Billings (1985)
Margaret Child, CLR Liaison
John Laucus (1986)
Peter Sparks, Library of Congress Liaison
David H. Stam (1985)
David C. Weber (1985)
Margaret A. Otto, Chair (1984)

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Research Library Staffing (1984)

Millicent D. Abell
Nancy A. Brown
Irene B. Hoadley
John P. McGowan
Russell Shank
Eldred Smith, Chair

Task Force on Scholarly Communication (Implementation of Objective One)

Hugh C. Atkinson
Stuart Forth
D. Kaye Gapen
Martin Runkle
George Shipman
William Studer
Charles Osburn, Chair

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access	George Gibbs, UCLA
ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee	Joan Chambers
ALA Statistics Coordinating Committee	Nicola Daval
ANSI Committee Z39	Joanne Harrar
CONSER Advisory Group	Carol Mandel
Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue	Ray Frantz
LC Cataloging-in-Publication Advisory Group	George Gibbs
LC Network Advisory Committee	William Studer
Society of American Archivists	Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange	Joanne Harrar
National Conservation Advisory Committee	David Stam
Voting Representative to IFLA	Shirley Echelman
Voting Representative to ANSI Committee Z39	Shirley Echelman
RLG Conspectus Development Task Force	David Farrell

APPENDIX G

MEMBERSHIP LIST
October 1984

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
Douglas E. Jones, Interim Dean of Univ. Librs.
(205) 348-7561

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2JB
Peter Freeman, Librarian
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 626-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Librarian
(602) 965-3417

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Liam M. Kelly, Acting Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Univ. Libn.
(801) 378-2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Douglas McInnes, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Merrily Taylor, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, University Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library, Davis
Davis, California 95616
William F. McCoy, Acting Univ. Libn.
(916) 752-2110

University of California, Irvine
The University Library
P.O. Box 19557
Irvine, California 92713
Calvin J. Boyer, University Librarian
(714) 856-5212

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, Riverside
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92517
Joan Chambers, University Librarian
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent D. Abell, Librarian
(619) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Joseph A. Boissé, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Canada Institute for Scientific & Technical Information
National Research Council of Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A OS2
Elmer V. Smith, Director
(613) 993-2341

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
Susan Coté, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
6050 South Kenwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Donald B. Simpson, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Martin D. Runkle, Director
(312) 962-8744

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Charles B. Osburn, Vice Provost
for Univ. Libraries
(513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice President
& University Librarian
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Librarian
(603) 646-2235

University of Delaware Library
Newark, Delaware 19717-5267
Susan Brynteson, Director
(302) 451-2231

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Elvin E. Strowd, University Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

Georgia Institute of Technology
Price Gilbert Memorial Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30332
Miriam Drake, Director
(404) 894-4510

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
John Black, Chief Librarian
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Wadsworth House
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Sidney Verba, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
John R. Haak, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robin Downes, Director
(713) 749-4241

Howard University Libraries
500 Harvard Place, N.W.
Box 1059
Washington, D.C. 20059
Kenneth Wilson, Acting Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
1408 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Univ. Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Elaine F. Sloan, Dean of Univ. Librs.
(812) 335-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
Dale M. Bentz, Univ. Librarian
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Librarian
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Don Tolliver, Director
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 287-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Larry X. Besant, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
Lance Dickinson, Acting Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
3459 McTavish Street
Montreal, Canada H3A 1Y1
Hans Möller, Acting Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

The University of Manitoba Libraries
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2
Canada
Earl Ferguson, Director
(204) 474-9881

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Univ. Libn.
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Thomas W. Shaughnessy, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Joseph H. Howard, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0N4
Marianne Scott, National Libn.
(613) 996-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Donald A. Lindberg, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
The University Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0410
James A. Rawley, Interim Dean of Librs.
(402) 472-2526

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
Fifth Avenue at 42nd Street
New York, New York 10018
David H. Stam, Director of the
Research Libraries
(212) 930-0708

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Univ. Libn.
(919) 962-1301

North Carolina State University
D.H. Hill Library
Box 5007
Raleigh, North Carolina 27650
I.T. Littleton, Director
(919) 737-2843

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60211
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Director
(219) 239-5252

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Dean, University Librs.
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
Roscoe Rouse, Dean of Lib. Ser.
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
George W. Shipman, Univ. Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 898-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh
217 Hillman Library
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Anne Woodsworth, Assoc. Provost
for Libaries
(412) 624-0907

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepp, Univ. Libn.
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-2900

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Samuel Carrington, Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
James F. Wyatt, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Hendrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada S7N OWO
Nancy A. Brown, Univ. Libn.
and Director of Libraries
(306) 343-4216

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 357-2240

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Charles R. Ritcheson, Librarian
(213) 743-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2015

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
Joseph Z. Nitecki, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Director of Libraries
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1000
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
Sterling C. Evans Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(409) 845-8111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Marilyn Sharrow, Chief Librarian
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
Philip E. Leinbach, Librarian
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-3558

Vanderbilt University Library
419 21st Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Malcolm Getz, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia
Alderman Library
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98194-5610
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Donald Bushaw, Interim Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5400

University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
Murray C. Shepherd, Univ. Libn.
(519) 885-1211)

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Peter Spyers-Duran, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario
DB Weldon Library
London, Ontario, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
D. Kaye Gapen, Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Libraries
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 2R2
Ellen Hoffmann, Director
(416) 667-2235